The American Scholar

Vol. II January · 1933 No. 1

646 Ruppenthal Class

Published Quarterly by

PHI · BETA · KAPPA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American Scholar

Vol. II January · 1933 No. 1

THE ΦBK SENATE

FLORENCE E. ALLEN
JAMES ROWLAND ANGELL
FRANK AYDELOTTE
EDWARD ASAHEL BIRGE
JULIAN A. C. CHANDLER
JOHN W. DAVIS
GEORGE H. DENNY
JOHN HUSTON FINLEY
GUY STANTON FORD
RAYMOND B. FOSDICK
FRANK P. GRAVES
EDWIN A. GROSVENOR
JOHN GRIER HIBBEN
NELSON GLENN MCCREA
ROBERT A. MILLIKAN
CLARK S. NORTHUP
ELLEN FITZ PENDLETON
ROSCOE POUND
DAVID A. ROBERTSON
ALBERT SHAW
FRANCIS W. SHEPARDSON
HENRY SUZZALLO
CHARLES F. THWING
JOHN JAMES TIGERT
OSCAR M. VOORHEES
MARY EMMA WOOLLEY
OWEN D. YOUNG

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

ADA LOUISE COMSTOCK
JOHN ERSKINE
JOHN HUSTON FINLEY
CHRISTIAN GAUSS
WILL DAVID HOWE
ALVIN S. JOHNSON
ADAM LEROY JONES
WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON
HARRY ALLEN OVERSTREET
J. HERMAN RANDALL, JR.
FREDERICK J. E. WOODBRIDGE

EDITOR
WILLIAM ALLISON SHIMER

ASSISTANT EDITOR
RUTH E. CAMPBELL

CONSULTING EDITOR
CLARK SUTHERLAND NORTHUP

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR is published four times a year, January, March, May, and October, by The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. The annual subscription is $2 (Canada, $2.25; foreign, $2.50). Editorial and business offices, 145 West 55th Street, New York, N. Y. Printing office, The Scribner Press, 311 West 43rd Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter January 27, 1932, at the Post-Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States of America. Copyright, 1933, by The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American Scholar

PHI BETA KAPPA, the college honorary society founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary in Virginia, the precursor of all the Greek-letter societies in America, publishes THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR not only for members of Φ B K but for all who have general intellectual interests.

OBJECTIVES

The promotion in America of liberal scholarship.

A medium for scholars and all persons who are interested in intellectual pursuits, higher learning, and the cultural development of America.

A synthesis of the arts and sciences essential to liberal education and a guiding philosophy of life.

The scholar's comprehension and disinterestedness in places of political and other leadership.

The scholar's responsibility for major social tendencies.

A whole diet for the whole mind.

Listed from Vol. I, No. 1, in *The International Index to Periodicals.*

DETACH HERE

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, 145 West 55th Street, New York, N. Y.

Please (check) (1) ..... enter, (2) ..... renew, (3) ..... change the address of, my subscription. If (1) or (2) is checked, I enclose $2.00 (Canada $2.25, Foreign $2.50).

Name *Address*

RENEWALS SUSTAIN LIFE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents

PAGE

Lucretia Mott, *Frontispiece* 4

(Through the courtesy of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt.)

Lucretia Mott — Mary R. Beard 5

A "radical with balance" who sought "truth for authority, not authority for truth." Mrs. Beard writes, not only as an historian but as a person with long experience in woman's suffrage and labor movements.

An Uncyclic Crisis and Capitalism for Culture — David Cushman Coyle 13

America at the brink, not of technocracy or socialism but a radically revised capitalism—the circulation of money in culturally, non-industrially productive enterprises.

The Light of the Party, *A Mock-heroic* — Kevin Guinagh 24

Teaching and the Spirit of Research — John Livingston Lowes 28

Facts cannot speak for themselves but need an interpreter as well as discoverer; a study in values by a brilliant exemplar-teacher, and author, among other books, of *Convention and Revolt in Poetry* and *Of Reading Books and Other Essays*.

The Ballad of Resurrection Bar — William Rose Benét 39

By the author of novels, stories, and many poems; now contributing editor to *The Saturday Review of Literature*.

The Philosopher-Saint: Spinoza — DeWitt H. Parker 43

A man, born in 1632, who, ostracized in his day, anticipated in a remarkable degree the world view advanced by recent writers in science and religion—Eddington, Jeans, and Whitehead.

College Music Goes Highbrow — John Tasker Howard 58

The undergraduate, to the dismay of the alumnus and the delight of this author, editor, and composer of orchestral and choral music, stages a revolt to the classics.

Sanctions and the World Community — Raymond Leslie Buell 70

A choice which may make the difference between world anarchy and world order; presented by the author of *Contemporary French Politics*, *International Relations*, and other books.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents

PAGE

Squandering Our Public Land — Earle D. Ross — 77

A critical review of malefactions for private gain—a mirror held up to the development of salient American traits and passions, not only in this but other aspects of our history—individualism, sectionalism, extravagance, corruption, and a utilitarian appreciation of the physical world.

The Private Thoughts of a Pedagogue — Bernard Iddings Bell — 87

Our colleges would sell "sweet odors of Araby to a people whose sense of smell is deadened."

Economists and the World Crisis — Elmer Davis — 93

In an address before the Phi Beta Kappa Alumni Association of New York this popular writer, for ten years on the editorial staff of *The New York Times*, gives us pause: Can we, willingly led astray by pre-depression prophets of instalment-plan increases in wealth, find a liberation from "human passions" among economists?

Editorial

The Universities and the Social Order — Rufus D. Smith — 106

Radicals! — 107

In the Realm of Scholarship

Should Scientific Discoveries Be Patented?—Elmer L. Sevringhaus — 108

Are Scholars News?—Arnaud C. Marts — 109

Internationalism in Mathematics—William D. Cairns — 111

Cooperation in Archeological Research—Silva New Lake — 112

The Institute of Law, Johns Hopkins University—Leon C. Marshall — 115

Foreign Fellowships — 115

Discussion

A Student Requests a Course on War—Rufus E. Miles, Jr. — 117

Comment Invited—Chester D. Pugsley — 120

"The American Scholar" Strikes Fire — 122

Phi Beta Kappa Authors — 124

NOTE.—Authors who wish manuscripts returned in case publication is not feasible should attach sufficient postage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LUCRETIA MOTT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lucretia Mott

MARY R. BEARD

TO make "a deep impress on the form and body of an age" so alive with intellectual and moral ferment as Lucretia Mott's required of a personality great mental and moral force. That she was both scholar and innovator is indicated, in a measure, by the fact that when she died in 1880 her career was described, at a memorial service, "as a part of the history of the American nation." She was born in 1793 just as the young republic made its début. She left the scene, most appropriately, just as its gilded age began to take on the material flourishes of Old World empires. The new spirit was not in key with her aspirations, for up to the moment of its flowering she had been brilliantly identified instead with the democratic movement in America. A sprite in physical size, Mrs. Mott was of heroic spiritual stature. The range of her mind and the clarity of her thinking, combined with her initiative and energy, made her a power among her fellow citizens who followed her leadership along a straight course of civilized conduct which paralleled the path of barbarism.

Mrs. Mott touched life at many vital points—sharing conspicuously in the struggle for more civil liberty, the making of democracy, the liberalization of religious faiths and practices, the awakening of the public to a sense of labor's claims, feminism, the abolition of slavery, and civic responsibility generally. Pickaninnies in the cotton fields of the New World and babes in noblemen's homes of England were named "Lucretia" in tribute to her might and majesty. Elderly contemporaries of her own race and nativity were proud to pass encomiums by her grave.

Lucretia Mott undertook to make democratic the class instrument of government which James Madison, "father of the Constitution," composed. She accomplished wonders in demolishing the structure of Protestant superstition and dogma which Thomas Jefferson more privately opposed. Like Alexander Hamilton rather than Thomas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jefferson, she supported commerce and industry, for she sprang from business circles; but she was never genial about profit-making in the manner approved by the founder of our manufacturing system. Northern wage slaves delighted her no more than Southern chattels and she also had a heart open to the woes of the Indians. Hamilton had based the new industry on the labor of women and "children of a tender age." Mrs. Mott called attention to the evils of this arrangement and demanded a deeper consideration of its consequences.

A bourgeois by heritage, her ethics were finer grained than the regular code of her kind. Mrs. Mott was a distant relative of Benjamin Franklin, and she herself possessed a "shrewdness, humor and commonsense" suggesting Poor Richard; yet she united with this lightness of mood a commanding severity in the presence of greed and intolerance, which sets her off with clear distinction from the author of that famous Almanac. On a philosophical footing with the first thinkers of her country, she was an extraordinarily active champion of the oppressed. While she pondered on the writings of the fathers in many fields, she organized and directed thousands of mothers in the task of applying creative philosophy. Against the proscriptions of the Friends in whose sect she grew to maturity, she mingled freely with other sects and joined with the "world's people" in humanistic enterprises. Groping with the learned for the light, in one direction, she also worked with the unlearned for the common cause—civilization.

If there was something "awful in her courage and reproof," there was likewise a "magic in her eloquence and a power in her calm, deliberate, but pitiless logic" which made of Lucretia Mott more of a pythoness than a virago. Having emphasized her vigor, it is necessary to recall her composure. Indeed she was celebrated for her gentleness as well as for her determination. John Quincy Adams referred to the brightness no less than the strength of her intellect, and her wit was one of her choicest assets. Sarcasm she understood but she used it with restraint and the effect was correspondingly electric when it was brought into play. One phase of her originality lay in her skill with respect to the implements to be employed in arguing and persuading. She was that strangest of strange creatures—a genuine radical with balance.

A little story may illustrate the point. Pacifism was her creed and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her method in many a tight place. When the annual meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society was raided in New York and broken up by a mob on one occasion early in its career, the speakers had to face a rowdy crowd as they left the hall. A gentleman was protecting the tiny Mrs. Mott but she was anxious about other women and urged him to go to their assistance. "Who will take care of you?" he asked. "This man," she replied, quietly taking the arm of one of the roughest-looking men in the throng; "he will see me safe through." And he did, dazed yet flattered by her confidence. The next day in a restaurant she saw the leader of that mob sitting at a table. As quietly as she had taken the arm of his husky ally the day before, she moved to the chief's table and began talking with him. When she left he too was her friend.

Who then was this remarkable person who, some say, accomplished as much as Harriet Beecher Stowe for the abolition of slavery and in addition stamped her personality on every other significant social movement in the United States long before the Civil War and for many years afterward?

Lucretia Mott was born a Nantucket Quaker of the old seafaring stock. Her father, Captain Coffin, was often away from home on long voyages during her childhood and her mother had to guide the family destiny on land. This she did ably, managing to supplement the uncertainties of the sea with the more or less certainties of merchandising on the shore. Mrs. Ann Coffin kept a shop, like other wives of sailors, and frequently its prosperity demanded that she go to Boston for supplies, which she procured in exchange for Nantucket oil and candles. The self-reliance that Emerson made a theme of beautiful letters, Mrs. Captain Coffin practiced and developed in everyday life.

Lucretia Coffin, however, did not spend her entire youth among the "followers of the sea" and their store-keeping wives. She was sent to school in 1804 when her parents moved to Boston and, although her father adhered to the strict tenets of the Friends concerning habits of industry and caution, his daughter attended now private and now public schools, thus "mingling with all classes without distinction." The program of self-reliance was not to make her narrow.

When she was fourteen years of age Lucretia entered a Friends' boarding school at Nine Partners in Dutchess County, New York, becoming quite a traveled young person among the "states." Her little

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sister was with her in this institution and the two girls remained there for two years without a single visit home. No week-end parties divided their interests between work and play. In fact Lucretia was so diligent about her studies that at the end of her second year she was appointed on the faculty of this school, a position which she accepted partly to enable her small sister to continue her education, there being eight children in the family.

The age of eighteen was Lucretia's marriage time and James Mott of old Long Island Quaker ancestry, idealistically inclined, was the bridegroom. They became Philadelphians after that. All accounts agree that the Motts led an exceptionally happy wedded life. Five children came to grace their hearth—children more easily than money, it appears. And in the circumstances their mother, as her own mother had done before, assumed the double burden of housewife and bread-winner, so lauded today by experimenting feminists. In other words, Mrs. Mott had both a "job" and a family. She in her turn had become a business woman.

Then James got steadier on his economic feet and Mrs. James turned to preaching, which they now felt they could afford, although the Friends disapproved of paying ministers. At twenty-five Lucretia Mott was a full-fledged expounder of religion in the meetings of her sect, journeying to distant places, from time to time, on this mission.

Ten years after she began preaching, that is in 1827–28, the Quaker sect was torn from center to circumference, like the New England Puritans, by religious dissent. In both cases liberals left the orthodox, separation involving questions of dogma, manners, and rationality—in short, modernism versus fundamentalism. Lucretia Mott moved with the liberal Friends and in some respects led the schism. Though she sided with Elias Hicks, the original trouble-maker in her own denomination, in his contention that "God did not need the blood sprinkled on the sacrifice, any more than he needed the smoke that rose from the ancient holocaust," and approved his other attacks on magic, she was no mere satellite but had an independent mind and will.

Akin to the Unitarians, as well, in her attitude toward the Unknown, Mrs. Mott was in all things an amazing rationalist for her day. Apparently she went beyond her kinsman, Benjamin Franklin, and beyond the Southern agnostic, Thomas Jefferson, in her devotion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to pure reason. She relied steadfastly on the inner light and logic. There was the least possible anthropomorphism in her make-up, considering her day and generation. Her faith, Emersonian in its sweep, was colored by a profound confidence in the universal human nature which Jefferson distrusted in part.

To her sister, Martha C. Wright, another great woman of antebellum America, Mrs. Mott wrote in the 1830's a letter containing these views:

> The more my attention is directed to a studied theology, and systematized Divinity, the more deeply do I deplore its unhappy effect on the mind and character; the tendency is to lower the estimate of practical righteousness, and rational Christian duties. How inviting is religion when stripped of the appendages of bigoted sectarism, and gloomy superstition! This is exemplified in our friend, J. M. McKim. His mind has at length burst the fetters of Presbyterianism, and, retaining all that is truly "pious" and valuable, he is walking forth in "the liberty wherewith Christ makes free."

Evidently in preacher McKim's mental progress, Mrs. Mott had been having a hand, judging from a letter she sent him in 1834:

> I regret that we cannot procure for thee all that Stuart has written opposed to Channing, because justice requires that we should acquaint ourselves with both sides, before we judge. What is furnished may satisfy thy mind, as far as controversial writings can do this: but permit me to question whether thy present wants will be met by perusal of works of this character. Rather consult the volume of thy own experience, and as thou acknowledges thy views slowly brightening, be patient, and rest in full faith for the rising of the sun, when, as thou art able to bear it, all mists and clouds will be dispelled. In the meantime, while reading and studying the Scriptures, let the *general tenor* of these invaluable writings govern thy conclusions, making all due allowance for the time and circumstances in which they were written; but do not puzzle and perplex thy mind with inferences from isolated passages here and there, which are contrary to the spirit of the whole, and do violence to the noble gift of reason, divinely bestowed upon us . . . while thou holds fast to that excellent sentiment that no text of Scripture however plain can shake thy belief in a truth which thou perceives by intuition, or make thee believe a thing which is contrary to thy innate sense of right and wrong, it will lead thee to frequent introversion, and thou wilt know "of whom thou learnest these things," and wilt not have need that any man should teach thee. . . .
>
> Worcester's "Causes of Contentions among Christians" I have in vain looked for, to send thee. Mine was returned a few days since. I enclose it for thy perusal; to be returned when thou hast done with it. John Woolman's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Journal, will, as we told thee, bear an attentive perusal; and although thou may see some parts strongly marked with Quaker superstitions and technicalities, yet lay it not aside on that account. Thou art capable of judging of the spirit of the writer; let that, with his sound reasoning, commend it to thy notice. I defend not the visionary part. . . .

I do not wonder at thy doubts of the propriety of occupying thy "station as minister" in preaching any system of faith, and care not how soon thy Orthodox brethren detect thy heresies; although I shall be careful how I expose them, well as I know that thy religious or *theological* opinions have been for some years past undergoing a change. I want thee to have done with calling Unitarian rationalities, "icy philosophizing." The step thou art taking is a serious one, and thy conclusions are of great importance.

This was penned, of course, before the age of anthropology!

Mrs. Mott likewise influenced capable women to join the crusade for intellectual liberalism. The feminist movement in America owes its origin preeminently to Lucretia Mott, her disciple Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and the disciple of the disciple, Susan B. Anthony. To this inspiration derived from a scholarly pioneer, Mrs. Stanton frankly attested. They were traveling companions in 1840, booked for the World's Anti-Slavery Convention to be held in London, and Mrs. Stanton describes the effect of that association in unmistakable terms:

Mrs. Mott was to me an entirely new revelation of womanhood. I sought every opportunity to be at her side, and continually plied her with questions, and I shall never cease to be grateful for the patience and seeming pleasure, with which she fed my hungering soul. On one occasion, with a large party, we visited the British Museum, where it is supposed all people go to see the wonders of the world. On entering, Mrs. Mott and myself sat down near the door to rest for a few moments, telling the party to go on, that we would follow. They accordingly explored all the departments of curiosities, supposing we were slowly following at a distance; but when they returned, there we sat in the same spot, having seen nothing but each other, wholly absorbed in questions of theology and social life. She had told me of the doctrines and divisions among "Friends"; of the inward light; of Mary Wollstonecraft, her social theories, and her demands of equality for women. I had been reading Combe's *Constitution of Man,* and *Moral Philosophy,* Channing's works, and Mary Wollstonecraft, though all tabooed by orthodox teachers; but I had never heard a woman talk what, as a Scotch Presbyterian, I had scarcely dared to think. . . .

I found in this new friend a woman emancipated from all faith in man-made creeds, from all fear of his denunciations. Nothing was too sacred for her to question, as to its rightfulness in principle and practice. "Truth for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority, not authority for truth" was not only the motto of her life, but it was the fixed mental habit in which she most rigidly held herself. . . . When I confessed to her my great enjoyment in works of fiction, dramatic performances, and dancing, and feared that from underneath that Quaker bonnet would come some platitudes on the demoralizing influence of such frivolities, she smiled, and said, "I regard dancing a very harmless amusement"; and added, "The Evangelical Alliance, that so readily passed a resolution declaring dancing a sin for a church member, tables a resolution declaring slavery a sin for a bishop."

If the celebrated meeting between Carlyle and Emerson is justly remembered as a subtle expression of intellectual intercourse, the meeting between Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Stanton, more articulate, was more significant for society. In the same manner, Mrs. Mott made disciples wherever she went. The orthodox Quakers gave her up reluctantly, knowing her power of leadership. And in the new fields which she entered she asserted that directing mind, with a program which included free religious thinking, serious social questioning, definitions of behavior with community interests as the stake, and the amicable settlement of all disputes.

Whether or not Mrs. Mott's reliance on right reason and her abounding optimism were intuitional or a reflection of a changing intellectual climate to which she was peculiarly adapted, certainly her Biblical scholarship provided her with an arsenal of argument and rich material for exposition. She worked at the Scriptures daily, knew them intimately, quoted accurately, and brought her own interpretation to bear against antagonists of a bigoted variety. And if Biblical textual scholarship is now questioned in a period of so many other kinds, let us remember that all mediæval scholarship rested on Bible learning; that out of its involutions theology was created, that Mrs. Mott's rebellious religious ancestor, George Fox, had not completed his revolution; that in denying a huge theological superstructure she helped to build for the individual in America a stronger foundation on which to erect a social faith. She knew well the early history of the Fox revolt and the condition of the Church of England at that hour; she also knew the constitutional law of the Friends' Society and stood firmly on her rights, as she called for further "progress"—to the annoyance of the complacent. Through no blind impulse but through reading and meditation, she burst one bond after another which held the popular thought to rigid molds, while re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maining a Quaker minister to the end. Being able to discomfit ecclesiastical experts in their own arena, she set patterns for many of the stirring "Letters to the Clergy" which announced an American womanhood on the left wing, in the fermenting forties.

Intimate in knowledge and effective as was her use of Biblical scholarship, Mrs. Mott did not derive her power from the Bible alone. Buckle's *History of Civilization* shared in the making of her broad culture and ideology. She loved poetry and could recite many splendid passages from memory. Edwin Arnold's *Light of Asia* was one of her favorite works. She loved action, too, and had observant eyes for realities. Not being cloister-bred, her insight and her energy bore her far beyond the confines of the religious circle and the pulpit, out into the marts of trade where the toiling, moiling masses struggled for their daily bread. There she illuminated with her spiritual understanding and emotional flame the thinking of oppressors and oppressed, reckoning even with personal sacrifice in her warfare on avarice. Thus she participated in the boycott of products made by slave labor and continued to live simply, no less than to preach the theory of restraint. At the same time her mental balance forbade an endorsement of the strict Quaker abstention from color, music, and painting. Her version of civilization and culture was truly refined as well as liberal, rationalistic, and humanistic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Uncyclic Crisis and Capitalism for Culture

DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE
Consulting Engineer

THERE is no use denying that the United States is having a bad case of economic determinism. Everything seems to be determined by the economic pains that color our whole world. And yet it is just possible that the "period of transition" through which we are apparently passing may have another meaning beside the one that centers around what we shall eat and wherewithal we shall be clothed. If we can get a clear understanding of what is happening to our economic mechanism perhaps we can visualize it as only a part, and not the central part, of the new developments that are ahead of us. In the past it has sometimes happened that when a society found it had more than enough of the necessities of life, that society went ahead into a new age of enlightenment. We have now come to such a stage in our history. If it presages, as similar conditions of plenty have done in the past, a new advance of civilization, the first thing we need to do is to learn, not so much how to adapt ourselves to the economic order, as how to arrange the economic order in such a way that it will adapt itself to us and to our desires.

There is still a widespread belief that this present business depression is just one more "low" in the business cycle, like those we have had so many times before. Many people believe that if we can pull in our belts and hold out, the hard times will pass over and prosperity will return. Many times in the past the end of an era seemed to have arrived, and then it turned out to be a false alarm. Anyone who calls this a period of transition is easily met by quotations from those prophets in other depressions who were afterward found to have been mistaken. History has repeated itself so often that we shall require very special reasons if we are to believe it has stopped repeating itself now. There are at least three such reasons, and they are cogent ones.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

History repeats itself only so long as the underlying conditions that compel it do not change radically. Some of those underlying conditions have now changed. The first in time, perhaps, was the growth of our population. The population of the United States was increasing at an accelerating rate when most of us first began to form our ideas of the world we live in. Business in this country was geared to a situation in which it had to expand faster and faster all the time. There was accordingly an increasing demand for new machinery. As fast as efficiency was increased and men were released from labor in the production of goods, the surplus laborers could be given jobs building more machines and more office buildings. Thrift was encouraged and savings were invested in hiring men to build new productive plants for our growing industries. Savings were in this way distributed to the consumers and returned to circulation. Buying power thus distributed itself by natural process, for whenever money began to be accumulated in masses it was soon spread around again by investment in the growth of industry. Business in that way got its market out of the processes of its own accelerating expansion.

But now the population is growing at a slower and slower rate. Because the demand for new machinery to take care of the needs of increasing numbers of people is no longer enough to furnish employment for all the men who are not occupied in the production and distribution of goods, something else has to be found to keep the customers of business supplied with buying power. The old line of development has run up against a new condition and is blocked. History has to stop repeating itself and start off in some new direction.

The foreign debt balance of the United States, both public and private, is the second condition that has stood in the way of a repetition of history. Before the War, since there was always a market for more exports than the amount of our imports, American business had become accustomed to a "favorable balance of trade." Because our foreign creditors had interest coming to them from us, foreign buyers could always buy more from us than we could buy from them. We shipped out more than we took in, simply because we owed more than was owing to us; but our minds had grown used to the idea that it was necessary to our prosperity to sell more abroad than we bought.

Then the War came and changed our status. We came out of the War with Europe owing us a good many billion dollars and paying

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest, more or less, every year; but instead of using the interest to pay for an extra volume of imports, as we might well have done, we went right on exporting more than we imported, just as we had been accustomed to do before the War. This meant that we did not take our interest "out," but reinvested it in more foreign bonds, and in addition lent fresh money every year to finance that part of our exports not balanced by imports. The post-war situation was not one which could continue indefinitely. Before the War the interest charges came somewhere near to paying for the unbalanced trade, and the total net balance was not very different from one year to another, but once we had become a creditor nation, the more bonds we bought the faster they piled up. It was like carrying a package of bombs that would not explode so long as we kept running upstairs faster and faster. Finally we reached the top and our foreign holdings, public and private, have been blowing up one after another ever since. History necessarily comes to a point of discontinuity when it reaches the end of such a cumulative process. From there on it starts off in some new direction.

These two factors of historical discontinuity have been observed and discussed by many writers, but the public has not yet realized how much more difficult they make a business recovery of just the type we have had before. Each one means the closing of one of our familiar fields of investment, and without a great deal of new investment an old fashioned revival can hardly be expected.

A third development, however, because of its spectacular qualities, is perhaps destined to attract more public attention. The "continuous process" is a new and portentous phenomenon in industry. In this new system of production a single machine is a whole factory, and there are practically no laborers at all. The raw materials are mechanically injected into one end of the machine and the finished products are mechanically counted and loaded on freight cars at the other end. A few expert mechanics and engineers keep an eye on the proceeding, but the human hand has no work to do except to turn a regulating dial once in a while. The continuous process had been developing slowly ever since the introduction of alternating current twenty years ago. Since 1929 it has been spreading rapidly from one industry to another. Already it has transferred several millions of the unemployed from temporary unemployment to permanent unemployment. As one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

company after another has met the fall of prices by introducing new machinery to cut costs, the men who were originally laid off because of depression have been made permanently unnecessary. It is estimated that if we were now to return to the scale of production of 1929, about half our present unemployed would still be without jobs. This progressive abolition of labor is another cumulative process, and the rate at which it accumulates is fantastic. History cannot go around a circle with a phenomenon like this one; it is bound to go ahead into some sort of crisis, and to take a fresh start there. The way in which the discontinuity of history is related to the progress of this new industrial revolution is worth examining in some detail.

One of the most vital processes of the capitalist system has always been the circulation of money by way of wages and capital investment. The money received by industry is in part paid out as wages to workmen who make and sell the products of industry. Another part is saved and set aside to be used as capital. Savings are redistributed to consumers when the savings are invested in new machinery and paid out to workmen in the building and machinery trades. Large incomes in particular are only to a small extent used directly as buying power to pay for personal expenditures. Much the larger part of such incomes, on the average, is invested and appears as buying power in the hands of the engineers and laborers who build commercial and industrial plants. An essential feature of the transfer of money from savings to the buying power of the building trades is that the money is not given but invested, which means that in each case the industry which is to use the new plant assumes a debt or a liability equal to the savings that have been used in building the plant. When the plant is finished and in operation it is expected to pay back interest and principal out of its profits.

There is a good deal of dispute about the exact nature of the circulation process, and the effects on it of such other factors in the economic system as gold movements and the erratic behavior of bank credit. To the ordinary layman unversed in these mysteries, however, it is likely to seem self-evident that if buying power is insufficient the way to increase it lies in such a stimulation of investment that savings will be spread around as fast as possible, with the consequent creation of greater buying power. The effect of the minor gadgets on the economic machine is commonly thought to be of secondary importance;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the fact is that the continuous process machine has upset the smooth course of history by causing a sudden growth of two of these unnoticed appendages until they overbalance what used to be the central process. The tail has become the dog, and the whole animal has to proceed from this point in the opposite direction.

The first of these subsidiary mechanisms that have suddenly become major factors is that by which the industrial system automatically regulates the total of the corporate debt. Instead of attempting to prevent excessive saving or excessive investing, business absorbs all the investment money that is offered, and then simply drops whatever obligations it is unable to meet. The business cycle is largely made up of the two halves of this process, coming alternately. First of all everyone invests money with great enthusiasm, and the bankers inflate credit and add the inflated credit to the pile. The resulting "paper" is a great comfort to those who have it in a bank box, but on the books of the country's industries it appears as liabilities. And then in the midst of this orgy everyone wakes up suddenly to the fact that business will never be able to carry such a burden of debt, and in the excitement enough businesses go bankrupt to reduce the burden to an endurable size. This rhythm of enthusiasm and fear makes up a considerable part of the business cycle. It fulfills two necessary functions, for the investments distribute accumulated savings into buying power, and the bankruptcies keep the burden of debt from becoming permanently unsupportable.

And whereas bankruptcy is considered by most people as just an unfortunate accident, the truth is that it is an essential part of a system in which the right to save money is unrestricted. By the same method that keeps the population of China within the capacity of the country to feed it, the total debt of industry is periodically cut down to what it can safely bear.

During the post-War period the disposal of excess savings by investment and bankruptcy has become an increasingly important function of finance. The War had left the country with a building shortage and large profits were made in the building industry and its speculative adjuncts. The interest on our investment balance abroad was also a kind of cream we had never before tasted. Added to this, our income tax was cut down, freeing considerable sums and making them available for investment. The total volume of savings thus grew beyond

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the needs of industry, and the excess savings naturally took the form of investments destined to subsequent loss. A good many billions went into foreign bonds, now either in default or selling at a loss. About 5 per cent of the country's income was currently dissipated by bankruptcy. But the major part of the savings of this period were expended for machinery that was to stand idle, and "rentable area" that was to prove unrentable. In all these cases the accumulated savings were distributed to workmen as wages or to their wives in the form of bargains. The foreign loans so balanced our foreign trade that we could export more goods than we imported. In effect, therefore, these loans were paid to American workmen to make goods for export. At the end of the process the workmen had the money, the foreigners had the goods, and the investors had the bonds. In the case of current bankruptcies during prosperity the number was largely made up of small enterprises such as stores. The investors bought goods to stock the stores, and then sold them at bankrupt sales to the public, at a loss. The bargain hunters got the goods, the workmen who made the goods got the money, and the investors got the experience. The third type of overinvestment, the overbuilding of factories and offices and apartment houses, served the same purpose as the other two, the workers in the building trades getting the buying power, and the investor getting "guaranteed" mortgage bonds.

Overinvestment-and-bankruptcy has always been the standard mechanism for the distribution of excess savings—the only process recognized by orthodox financial opinion as "sound." "Sound" financial practice requires that once a sum of money has been set aside as "capital" it becomes sacred and has to be treated in a special way. Except in the form of some "self-liquidating" investment which imposes a debt on somebody, it must not be paid out to workmen.

The revolutionary change now under way is centered in the extraordinary effect produced on this standard mechanism by the "continuous process." A million dollars worth of new investment in one of these new machines can bankrupt twenty million dollars worth of existing plants. The building of the machine may employ forty men for two months, and throw ten thousand out of that industry permanently. There are industries, moreover, in which the limits of available raw materials can easily be reached, and as progress continues their number will increase rapidly. In such a situation, with a small

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount of money required to build the new apparatus, and a large amount of bankruptcy required to clear the old from the books, the principles of "sound" finance will have to adapt themselves to inescapable facts. Either people will have to be persuaded not to set aside very much money for investment, or else the money that has been set aside for investment will need to be reconsidered and spent after all. The standard method of investing it regardless, and losing it afterward, can be worked only so long as the bankruptcy is kept hidden from the investor by a decent veil. The effect of the new technological processes is to make it increasingly hard to keep even the most simple investor from realizing what happens to those who think it is smart to be thrifty.

Apparently we have come to the end of the usefulness of the old standard method for the distribution of accumulations of money. Even if the present attempts to revive prosperity by stimulating a new wave of investment should lead to a renewal of enthusiasm in Wall Street, the effect would be to accelerate the installation of new plants. And when the new plants were ready for action, the bankruptcy of old plants would be very discouraging to a continuance of the boom.

The function of bankruptcy in automatically adjusting the debt structure is not the only minor appendage of the economic machine to be transformed into a major factor. The other mechanism which has suddenly become important is one that had been given practically no recognition whatever as a serious economic process. The fact is that large incomes are not actually divided entirely between personal expenditures and reinvestment in Wall Street. They are in part distributed by way of contributions to institutions performing cultural and philanthropic services, and by way of income taxes to the Government for public services. The essential feature of these processes is that through them accumulated money is spread out into consumer buying power without producing any corresponding goods for sale and without imposing any corresponding debt on business. These processes are a bypass around the system of "sound" finance, now so hopelessly choked.

With the arrival of the continuous process history has come to a turning point that makes it impossible to go on relying upon investment-and-loss as a practicable device for redistribution of accumulated money. History is likely to start off in some new direction, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the use of contributions and income taxes as redistribution agents is the only apparent way out, if we are to keep the capitalist system.

As the facts of the technological revolution become known to the public, there will be a growing realization that these facts require a revaluation of old economic theories and financial practices. Among those who have come in touch with the engineering group known as "Technocracy," this realization is already noticeable. The unquestioned facts in regard to the progressive abolition of labor in industry make it no longer possible to imagine a return to prosperity by any process of "normal" recovery. Already the work of education done by the Technocracy group has had a wholesome effect in spreading the realization that we have come to a new order of things, and that from this point we go in some new direction.

There are apparently two divergent directions we might take. They may be called the democratic and the technocratic roads. Since there is every indication that a battle will be fought before history decides which road to follow, it is worth while to consider both roads, that we may be able to take sides intelligently in the battle.

As far as concerns its proposals for the future organization of the social order, Technocracy is still something of a secret society. Enough is known, however, to serve the purposes of this very general discussion. The proposed new order is to be in the form of a hierarchic dictatorship, like that in a typical corporation, in which all the citizens will be both stockholders and workers. Money and trade are to be abolished, all citizens are to be assigned work to do, and all citizens are to be given tickets entitling them to an equal share of the total product. The values of products at the company store are to be stated in ergs of energy, and each citizen is to have his dividend expressed in ergs.

This apparently fantastic ultra-communism—or ultra-fascism, if you prefer—is much more seriously regarded by distinguished business and professional leaders than one might think at first glance. It is, after all, hardly more fantastic than the system of starving in the midst of plenty as we are doing at present. Technocracy has at least the virtue of being a mathematically valid adjustment of society to a condition of intense productivity, and if there are any reservations in our minds about subscribing to such a radical reorganization, they had best be held not too positively or dogmatically. In case the coun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try should continue to drift until the day comes when something has to be done immediately, the fact may appear that no other group in the country has either a detailed plan for collecting the pieces, or the leadership and genius to enforce a plan if it had one. It is best to admit that, so far as now appears, Technocracy is the apparent heir, if democratic adjustments are not effected adequately and rather soon.

The democratic alternative has been already implied in the earlier part of this paper. Specifically it consists in the abandonment of the idea that accumulated money has to be invested, whatever the consequences, and in the use of income taxes either to collect such accumulations and spend them or to divert them into contributions for cultural purposes. The technocratic economic theory denies that capitalism can continue in any form, because each time that capitalism tries to operate it piles up debt, and because the investment-and-loss sequence has become too painful to be endured. The hole in the theory is the assumption that it is necessary to pile up debts. Such a piling up has always been customary, and all good bankers believe it is part of the laws of nature, but it is not. The bankers are mistaken, and so are the Technocrats. There is no mathematical reason why capitalism cannot operate, at any rate of productivity the engineers can make possible, and with large differences in individual incomes, provided those who get the larger incomes are persuaded, forced, or otherwise led to devote their surplus to public or semipublic services. The only thing that has become obsolete and that cannot any longer exist in this new age of productivity is the reinvestment of large incomes.

The particular adjustment recommended here is only one of several possible methods for the distribution of buying power. It has the virtue of consisting of familiar measures, all of which have such powerful support in the new Congress that they have some chance of being seriously considered. These measures have the further advantage of meeting the fundamental problem squarely. Such proposals as the forced distribution of excess profits in the form of bonuses to wage earners, for instance, suffer from the fact that the really serious problem is not that of low wages merely, but even more than this, the impossibility of employing most of the labor in mechanical industry on any basis whatever. A general policy of creating employment seems a more practical way to make wages rise than an attempt to raise wages by law. Another difficulty encountered in such a pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posal, as Mr. George Soule pointed out in the December *Harpers Magazine*, is that, because of differing costs in different plants, it would be necessary to establish a general production plan. And this would beg the whole question. The question is this: whether to plan only the flow of money and preserve our freedom to experiment in production, or to plan production and sacrifice freedom to efficiency under a Technocratic dictatorship.

Serious consideration should be given, especially by those whose interests are cultural, to the choice between these two forms of social order. What is it that is really happening to us now and what do we want to have come out of it? The following interpretation can be taken for what it is worth—it is one engineer's idea of the underlying meaning of this technological revolution.

The era of plenty is not a new thing, though its previous occurrences have been on a small scale. The Periclean Age in Athens was the result of a sudden accession of wealth, releasing people from labor on the necessities and giving them employment on public works. Elizabethan England similarly rested on the rich Spanish plate-fleets, and Renaissance Italy on the profitable Oriental trade. Perhaps the most perfect examples are to be found in Melville's description of life in the South Sea Islands before the coming of white men's civilization. The natives of these islands, after providing such food and shelter as the resources of the place permitted, had a good deal of labor power left over. Instead of investing their surplus productive power in piling up extra canoes and fishing tackle they employed it in religious and social observances, and in all the various arts of tropical life. In all of these cases the reaction of normal human societies to an accession of riches has been a development of art.

The contrast between the simple, direct, and eminently sensible behavior of a South Sea Island Community when confronted with plenty to eat, and that of our own in similar circumstances, is explainable on the ground of the difficulty encountered in seeing such a large situation as ours all in one pattern. The savage did not need to be very bright to see that when he had enough equipment there was no sense in wasting time to make any more. It is not so easy for us, yet that is just our case. We have so much equipment that it is absurd to save to pile up more and more until we are choked. And that is just why the time has come for the dawn of an age of cultural advance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Uncyclic Crisis and Capitalism for Culture

Whatever may be the case in some parts of Europe, America is not in a decline. We are still young, though our economic order seems old and tired. We have had three hundred years of pioneer advance and growth of material wealth. We have been in the caterpillar stage of progress; the mature butterfly that will specialize on beauty rather than on the Puritan virtues of thrift and hard work has yet to appear. We have had all the characteristics of a caterpillar: the same magnificent ugliness set off with spots of ill fitting beauty; the same later stage of glorious fatness of body and brain, hiding, somewhere in the dark interior, the slowly maturing destiny of the future. The caterpillar is old and tired enough; he ought to be; for him this is the end.

Everything points to the truth of the prophecy that when we reach our new adjustment to the age of plenty the adjustment will embody a cultural renaissance. It is not for us to predict what form of culture our descendants will build upon this foundation. Our job is to lay foundations well and truly.

If a new culture is to come the economic adjustment needs to be on the democratic rather than on the technocratic side. The latter calls for government of all organized society by the economic system that produces and distributes material goods. The former assumes the right of society, acting as a whole, to apply certain regulatory measures to the economic system and then to devote its main attention to other things. Technocracy would abolish freedom in the interest of efficiency. Individualism in its new form would enlarge freedom of initiative at the expense of efficiency, since the efficiency of these new machines is so great that there is plenty to spare.

There is no logical necessity for cutting down our freedom of initiative because we can produce more with less labor. Such a situation requires planning, but not detailed planning of individual schedules and activities. It needs social control to prevent a jamming of its distribution system, and a policy of conservation of irreplaceable natural resources; but outside a few measures like these, it is our world to enjoy. Because there is plenty for everybody it is less rather than more necessary to be careful about small matters. Restricting our freedom because we have solved the problem of production is the last absurdity. Rather have we been made more free to waste time and money in experimentation and exploration, and in art and sport, and in adventures in all the arts of life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Light of the Party

KEVIN GUINAGH

EVERYBODY has some pivotal idea about which he believes the reformation of the world centers. I once thought that if all our citizens would retire at 9:30 P.M., much of the evil in the world would vanish. Of course my thesis was not original. It was only an amplification of the saw, "Early to bed, early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise." I learned to elaborate my doctrine with some skill, but dropped the theory when a learned Biblical scholar pointed out to me that the shepherds who saw the wonders in the heavens at the birth of Christ were tending their flocks all through the night.

I have discovered a new panacea for the ills of the world. I am indebted for the information to a volume owned by my grandfather. Its title page reads: "*Beauty;* illustrated chiefly by an analysis and classification of the Beauty of Woman, by Alexander Walker, author of *Intermarriage, Woman, Physiognomy Founded on Physiology, The Nervous System,* etc." The preface is dated 1836, but the work was re-edited in 1841. On page 217 I came upon a passage which will, I feel, be the remaking of my life and that of countless others. It read:

> Though nature gives long hair to woman it has sometimes been the fashion to wear it short; and though man has naturally shorter hair, it has sometimes been the fashion to cherish its growth, and to shave the beard from the face. The latter has especially been the case in degenerate and effeminate times; and this has sometimes been accompanied by remarkable consequences.

These words, "effeminate and degenerate," stung me to the quick, for if there is anything I am punctilious about it is the daily shave. It cannot be that there is a connection between one's character and a shaven face, I thought. But the book definitely stated so on page 217. Here then was the reason for my inconspicuousness in life. I had failed to let nature take its course. But this could be remedied during two weeks vacation. My curiosity desired to know the other argu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments that Walker offered in proof of his point that the wearing of the beard is a manly and noble habit. I read further:

> Nature made it distinctive of the male and female; and its abandonment has commonly been accompanied not only by periods of general effeminacy, but even by the decline and fall of states. They were bearded Romans who conquered the then beardless Greeks; they were bearded Goths who vanquished the then beardless Romans; and they are bearded Tartars who now promise once more to inundate the regions occupied by the shaven and effeminate people of western Europe.

If then a man would be a superior personality, an *übermensch*, it became increasingly clear to me that he must not shave. Once he does he becomes weak, as Samson became weak when Delilah cut his hair. With this Biblical background it would be possible for a facile theologian to work up an argument to prove that Revelation substantiated the view that shaving nations are on the verge of slavery. The Greeks shaved and the bearded Romans conquered them; the Romans shaved and the bearded Goths conquered them. Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* does not mention this as a cause contributing to the collapse of the Roman government. He charged Christianity with breaking up the Empire and was placed on the *Index Expurgatorius* for his trouble. Probably he did not get at the bottom of the matter.

The more I thought about the question, the clearer it became to my mind that this simple method would assure me of the conquering spirit. Observe how Walker strengthens his argument:

> In further illustration of the manliness of this habit we may observe that throughout Europe wars have generally led to its temporary and partial introduction, as at the present day. Those assuredly blunder who ridicule the wearing of the beard. Silly affectation, on the contrary, is imputable only to those, who, by removing the beard, take the trouble so far to emasculate themselves! and who think themselves beautified by an unnatural imitation of the smoother face of woman!

Some of those soldiers who fought and bled in France for freedom may remember the generous assignments at kitchen duty that the U. S. soldier received when he appeared for morning inspection without being properly shaven. But Walker saves himself because he refers in one place to the temporary and partial introduction of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beard in times of war. A school boy can see that a soldier who had to be shaven for inspection each morning would favor a mustache. The shaving of the upper lip with the aid of cold water has brought tears to many a stout heart.

It has always taken me about fifteen minutes of each day to shave. Now, I have read the advertisements in the newspapers, and it seems to me I have seen an outline of the great educational possibilities in fifteen minutes' reading a day. I too can be the cynosure of all eyes. I can be the one to whom a group of men will suddenly appeal for a decision. Let others be the life of the party; I shall be its light. No longer will my wife upbraid me as we are driven home by snarling: "You never said a thing all night." I shall have much to say and those who fail to listen will rue the day. I shall not be hesitant about offering the recipe for my success. I shall tell everyone so that they too may follow in my footsteps. In two weeks the financial "jip" sheets may give out definite information that safety razor stock should be sold short.

A good homily includes a practical story illustrating the truth of the argument. A French writer tells us that one of the greatest misfortunes the French people ever had to bear was occasioned by shaving. The French, as everybody knows, are very partial to the beard. It lends the most untutored villager an unquestionable dignity, and when it is worn by a man whose features bespeak intelligence the effect is most overpowering. Louis le Jeune decided to shave his chin and to keep his hair closely cropped. His wife, Elinor of Guyenne, addressed her husband, not without some spirit, on the theme as follows:

"My lord, this coiffure of thine pleaseth me not. I do beseech thee most earnestly to give up thy mad desire to set the times aright by cropping thy beard. Dost thou not know that this fad of thine is neither manly nor noble?"

"Good Elinor," quoth Louis, "thou dost not constantly perceive the unpleasant aroma that rises therefrom. In the supping of soup, my lady, I do, spite by best care, suffer some to fall upon my beard and when the temper hath gone from the liquid, there remaineth with sundry bits of vegetables a rare greasiness that pleaseth me not. Is this not unseemly in a ruler?"

"I deem it more unseemly in my lord that he strives to emulate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

womanish affectation. For whom, may I ask, is my lord keeping kissable?"

"For shame, Elinor! This is not fair. My virtue is unsullied."

"Thou hast made thyself a very varlet among thy peers," she continued. "I cannot brook the loud jests I hear whispered in the court. The world would know, my lord, if I married a tonsured monk. By our lady, you must choose between thy smooth face and me."

One word brought on another more wrathful than the former. The Lady Elinor left the side of Louis forever. With her went the rich provinces which had come to France as her dowry. Elinor married again, this time an English noble. The provinces, therefore, became the object of dispute. For four hundred years this war raged. How much woe did this prince not bring to France by his churlish persistence in applying the razor to his face?

Walker (1836) has helped me to reorganize my life. Here in comparative solitude I am raising a Van Dyke. As some men go aside at times to think over spiritual affairs, so I have stepped aside from the crowd to reform my habits and to investigate my appreciations. "Why go into retirement for such a work?" the reader may inquire. Let me say that this is almost the *conditio sine qua non* of perseverance. Moreover, a man should feel that when he adopts the beard there must be a certain pause for the reformation of his manner. It is a time for recollection. Many submit themselves to a deal of raillery and consequent humiliation when the work is in progress by undertaking this task together with the customary daily occupations. So great is the ridicule heaped upon the head of him who is growing a beard that few can survive it, but once it has grown—*voilà*, there can be no ridicule. The timid boy seems mature. The weak, retreating chin is concealed. A gravity of manners soon follows. Other men will listen when he speaks, for he has the facial contour of a German scientist, a French critic, an Italian painter.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Teaching and the Spirit of Research

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES

Francis Lee Higginson Professor of English Literature, Harvard University

MAY I begin by stating clearly the limitations which I have imposed upon my theme?

It is to the members of a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences that what I mean to say is addressed. And the primary end of such a School is to train scholars who are also teachers, or teachers who are also scholars, as you please. It is, then, the relations of research to that desideratum, and to that alone, of which I mean to speak. The great field of pure research lies outside my purpose here.

I wish there were another word than "research" which I might use. For to most of you the associations of the term are chiefly, if not wholly, with doctoral dissertations and all that in them is. And that is not the association which I have in mind at all. For in linking *teaching* with research I am thinking of something far more deeply interfused than that (if I may put it so) with the activities which soon enough will face you. What I have in view is rather an attitude of mind, an openness to hints, suggestions, intimations—from the fall of an apple at Woolsthorpe, to a flash from a page in a book taken down from the shelf—a responsiveness to suggestions which may come unbidden, and beckon along untravelled roads to regions which are new to us, and (it may be) even to our little world. It is, in a word, something to be thought of rather as an adventure than as a task imposed—something which, through calling us at times from our beaten paths, may on occasion save our pedagogical souls alive. That, then, is what I mean to talk about. Your professional training, except by implication, it is not my business to discuss.

What underlies that training is, however, both my affair and yours. For that winged thing, intellectual discovery, is no footless bird of

An address delivered at the Convocation for the Conferring of Advanced Degrees at Brown University, June 1932.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paradise. It must have a *pou sto* from which to spring. I have spoken of hints and suggestions which lead one into fresh fields. But there has to be something for one's hint, one's intimation to connect with, before new *aperçus* can be born. There must be two poles to a battery before a spark can flash. Things have meaning only as they associate themselves with other things, and they take on added meaning only as those associations multiply. It is only when one's mind is already a storehouse of impressions that it will possess the focal points on which fresh impressions will converge. A page from a travel-book will not set up relations with a poem, or a phrase in a medical treatise leap across centuries to illuminate *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, or a volume taken down by chance suggest questions to which we may turn in our so-called leisure hours for months, unless we first know our poet, and our Burton, and unless we have the trick of ranging far afield. It was because Newton's apple fell into a reservoir already stored with the observations and ponderings of years that human thought about the laws of the universe was revolutionized. For it is not in the spiritual world alone that "unto him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance." And it is just that preliminary storing of the cells which much of the training which you have been undergoing is designed to initiate. But your life will not suffice to complete the enterprise.

I am not just now much concerned with what we call our additions to the sum of human knowledge. That in the end may be your happy fortune. It is rather the effect of a habit of mind upon one's *teaching* that is the point. And teaching is effective—if one must be axiomatic—only when the one who teaches is intellectually alive. May I draw for a moment upon first-hand experience? Through the accident of having years ago shifted from one field to another, I suffered—to paraphrase the Scriptures—many things of many teachers in one undergraduate and three graduate or professional schools, over a period of eleven years. And out of the scores of teachers under whom in consequence I sat, two tower head and shoulders above the rest. And the reason for that preëminence is to the point. It was because, through their vividness and their vitality, and through their gift of bringing to bear at will on the subject they were treating whatever was pertinent in the whole wide range of their learning, they awakened intellectual curiosity and stirred to emula-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. One felt one's self *kindling*—to use Dorothy Wordsworth's word about her brother—under their influence. And they were men who thus stirred intellectual curiosity—and this is my point—because they were endowed with it themselves. For they were both of them inveterate explorers in their respective fields. Much of what they said has been in the lapse of years forgotten. It was their *spirit*, their *vivida vis animi*, which after one's kind one caught. One thinks —with a difference—of what Goethe said of Winckelmann: "*Man lernt nichts, wenn man ihn liest, aber man wird etwas*"—You learn nothing when you read him, but you *become* something. In their case one learned, and learned enormously. But that, as one looks back, was as nothing to what, through their power of awakening, one became. And the fact that they were among the most learned men whom I have ever known is not without significance. For it is not learning that is dull. It is only learned men who sometimes make it so. And since you are by way of becoming learned yourselves, and teachers to boot, the implicit caveat is not impertinent.

For it is salutary to remember, too, that the dullest, most utterly benumbing teachers may be, and sometimes are, the most erudite. You cannot know, let me say at once, too many facts, unless—and there's the rub—you ossify in them. We can ossify you know. Like Mephistopheles, "*Ich habe schon in meinen Wanderjahren Krystallisiertes Menschenvolk gesehn*"—men fossilized like pterodactyls (which once had wings) under their accumulations. There are minds—to shift the figure—which are crowded reservoirs of facts, but the reservoirs are stagnant. I have just referred to two great teachers. Their power lay in one's sense of the immediacy, the pungent freshness of their knowledge, drawn from the fountain-heads themselves. But I have also sat under teachers—they are most of them, like Chaucer's Petrarch, "now deed, and nayled in hir chestes"—through whose teaching no streams flowed: learned men, who year after year rehearsed essentially what they had said the year before, not even always "*mit ein Bifschen andern Worten.*" No spark disturbed one's clod. One learned from them little which one could not better have learned one's self from the sources of their information. And "to sit" —as Carlyle observed of Coleridge's talk—"to sit as a passive bucket and be pumped into . . . can in the long run be exhilarating to no creature." Learning, even erudition, will be quickening or dulling,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alive or dead, according as its possessor has or lacks the adventuring mind.

There is a remark of G. K. Chesterton which the late Stuart Sherman used to quote: "There are no uninteresting things; there are only uninterested people." Now things are interesting when they excite our desire to know more, when they stir us from a passive to an active frame of mind; when, in a word, they awaken intellectual curiosity. And the possession of that, and the power of kindling it in others—for it is contagious—are the earmarks of the scholar who is a teacher too. There is a queer notion abroad that in the field of scholarship, "interesting" and "superficial" are apt to be synonyms. On the contrary, it is only when one has steeped one's self in one's subject, and ranged it from end to end, that the full power of its fascination (I am using the word deliberately) can ever be exerted. That is what leads us on, and it is the communication of that spell which makes great teaching. And the case for intellectual curiosity, imaginative vision—call it what you will—is essentially the case for culture in Matthew Arnold's famous dictum. For the value to a teacher of the discoverer's bent of mind is precisely this: that through its alert responsiveness to suggestion, and its keenness in following where suggestion leads, it does vivify, like a freshly flowing stream, masses of knowledge which otherwise lie leaden and inert. One's individual explorations may or may not have momentous consequences for learning. That for the moment is not the point. The thing is that the spirit of one's expeditions, minor exploits though they may be, into the territory of the unexplored will permeate one's whole attitude toward the body of knowledge handed down from the explorers and the builders of the past. And it will also pervade and vitalize one's teaching. It is quite on the cards that the results of our personal excursions may never directly enter that teaching at all. It is the attitude of mind which they stimulate that is the vital thing. What you know and don't teach permeates and fecundates what you teach. And if you want to find supremely stated the essence of the spirit which I am trying to express, reread the sonnet "On First Opening Chapman's Homer," and ponder that.

To have, then, if we're lucky enough, our own adventure which may lead us along untrodden ways into undiscovered lands, and keep our eye alert and our sense of values keen—that good fortune may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enhance the very powers which lend life to teaching. But what I have called the spirit of research will far more directly quicken what we teach. You obviously cannot, when you begin, have first-hand knowledge of everything with which you have to deal. But if you are to keep your mind alive, you dare not rely, nor will you, on knowledge gained at second-hand. Your training, whatever it may have been, in formal research is useless, except in so far as it develops a bent of mind which instinctively strikes for the fountain-heads. Let me use the simplest possible illustration of what I mean. And I must draw, for obvious reasons, upon my own field. The principle is common to all fields.

Take, as a single one of countless instances, the great Ode on "Intimations of Immortality." Of what experience *is* that the imaginative projection? How can you know? Every book about Wordsworth discusses the Ode, and you may take that short and easy way. If you have the instinct which strikes for the heart of things, you will turn to Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journal.* And you will find between March 14 and March 27, 1802, in a sensitive and revealing personal chronicle, the records of a veritable nest of poems. And four of them stand in intimate connection through their expression of a common mood—a mood first stirred by vivid recollections of childhood, awakened by the sight of a butterfly. On Sunday morning, March 14, Dorothy Wordsworth writes: "While we were at breakfast . . . [William] wrote the poem 'To a Butterfly.' . . . The thought first came upon him as we were talking about the pleasure we both always felt at the sight of a butterfly"; and then follow charming childhood reminiscences. Nine days later Dorothy wrote: "William worked at 'The Cuckoo' poem." Two days later: "William wrote to Annette,"—the entanglement of Wordsworth's soul with the world during just those days was acute—"then worked at 'The Cuckoo.' . . . While I was getting into bed, he wrote 'The Rainbow' "—the lines, that is, beginning: "My heart leaps up when I behold A rainbow in the sky." And the next day's entry begins: "A divine morning. At breakfast William wrote part of an ode." I am tearing, as I must, the bare entries from the graphic context which gives them life. But each of those four poems, written within less than a fortnight, is the expression of one dominating mood, called up by the glimpse of a butterfly, the call of the cuckoo, the sight of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a rainbow—the mood from which the first four stanzas of what Coleridge called "The Immortal Ode" one morning at breakfast sprang. And if one read these four stanzas in conjunction with "The Butterfly," "The Cuckoo," and "My Heart Leaps Up," one gains a conception of their meaning such as all the critics, commentators, and biographers together cannot give.

Moreover, the last seven stanzas of the Ode, written almost three years later, after the tragic death of Wordsworth's sailor brother John, form again one of a group of four poems, of which the great "Elegiac Stanzas" and "The Happy Warrior" are two. And only by reading together these four, in the light of the family letters, can one feel the significance of the new and lofty mood in which profound personal grief is lifted into the atmosphere of "calm of mind, all passion spent," and in which the earlier stanzas are taken up and wrought with the later ones into a splendid and consistent whole. And if one further observe that Wordsworth, when he finally brought all his poems together, set, after "Poems written in Youth," "The Rainbow" at the beginning and the Ode at the end, one recognizes that to him their common theme epitomized his deepest thought. Nothing on earth will make all that *real*, save saturation in those intimately interrelated poems themselves. And the ardency of mind which leads one to that is what I call the spirit of research. And that ardency lends in turn contagious quality to one's teaching.

Or poems may spring not only from the contacts of a poet's mind with cuckoos and butterflies which in the end may lead him to "truths that wake, To perish never," but also from the stimulus of provocative personal relations. And I wish I dared stop to illustrate the thing I am trying to clarify, from that brilliant conjunction of Byron, and the Shelleys and Claire Clairmont, and John Cam Hobhouse, and "Monk" Lewis, and Dr. Polidori, and Madame de Staël, on the shores of Lake Geneva between April and October in 1816. *Manfred*, conceived and largely written then, is the most copiously discussed of all Byron's dramas. You will never begin to understand it —and I think I know—until you have thrown overboard your baggage of second-hand critical apparatus and have read, for those months, Mary Shelley's diary, and Shelley's letters to Peacock, and Byron's to John Murray and Augusta Leigh, and Byron's and Hobhouse's journals of their expedition into the Bernese Oberland, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Polidori's journal and the Countess Guiccioli's book, and the storybook called *Fantasmagoriana*, and *The Vampire*, and *Frankenstein*—a collection of human documents seldom matched for their vividness and their absorbing interest. Read those—and *Manfred*, from being dead, will come alive. And out of that welter of human documents a question may thrust up its head, like Proteus rising from the sea—a question so provocative that one's attempt to answer it may metamorphose one's whole conception of the drama. But whether that be so or not, the spirit which leads you instinctively back to the life itself from which poem or drama springs will vivify, when you teach, your interpretation of the imaginative projection—ode or drama—of that experience.

For literature is *life taking form*, and only your own imaginative projection of yourself into that human experience will reveal to you the coalescence, in a work of art, of raw stuff and imaginative energy. The trouble too often is that the people who know the facts don't use their imagination; the people who have imagination don't trouble with the facts. It is the combination, in whatever field, which is the rare, the priceless thing.

Now that, and not set tasks, is what I mean by research in relation to teaching. It is a response to that spirit of the discoverer which one's teaching should animate, not dull. For, like the quality of mercy, it is twice bless'd. Not only does it lend life to our teaching, but our teaching may quicken it. Often in the very act of teaching—as every one who truly teaches knows—when the effort to reach other minds kindles and clarifies one's own, one's perceptions strike suddenly into unforeseen relations, and old problems fall into fresh perspective, or new quests are born. But that will come only when the cells are stored. And if you wish a brilliant and provocative study of the relation between that storing of the cells and those flashes of vision which may issue in discovery, and which do lend wings to teaching, read Henri Poincaré's great chapter on "Mathematical Discovery" in his *Science et Méthode*. For what I have been saying of literature is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of every field.

It may be that I am giving the impression that research, as I am treating it, is a thing merely of happy chances, flashes of inspiration, lucky *aperçus*. If so, I have not made my meaning clear. I am assuming, as axiomatic, rigorous exactness in both the employment and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the presentation of one's facts; scrupulous verification of every statement resting on authority; wise caution in drawing inferences; a vigilance which overlooks no evidence—in a word, the inexorable demands of scientific method in the conduct of research. But that once for all understood, the gift of the utmost value to teaching and to one's research alike is the faculty which we name *vision*. Call it imagination, if you will, so that you keep the sense of a power which sees relations where the eye sees only facts; which sees the lines of form that strike through seeming chaos; which sees in phenomena apparently diverse, their underlying unity. But the facts must first be mastered before their relations may be seen; one must make one's way, like Satan, through the "strait, rough, dense, or rare" of chaos, before its elements fall into form; one can never reach the underlying unity of disparate phenomena save when one has come to grips with the phenomena as they appear. And that exacting business is not, in old Thomas à Kempis's words about another matter, *opus unius diei, nec ludus parvulorum*—it's a long trick, and a man's job. Vision is a gift—a free gift of the gods, if you will. But its exercise demands knowledge arduously acquired. For vision—which is seeing with what lies behind the eye—is not something independent of knowledge, or somehow superadded upon knowledge when it is acquired. It is a faculty which works *through* knowledge. And knowledge without vision is barren, as vision without knowledge distorts. It is only when we have won our way through our chaos of obdurate facts that "*die guten Einfälle*"—flashes of insight, happy conjectures—come and stand before us "*wie freie Kinder Gottes*," as Goethe says, and cry out "Here we are!" But it is we who must build the road by which they reach us.

And the road by which they reach others too. I have thus far been speaking of the bearing of all this upon your teaching. But many of you will some day have to communicate the results of your explorations to what we love to call the learned world. It may even occur to you that beyond those sacred precincts there are readers of no less intelligence and of equally inquiring minds. In our attempts at exposition, in a word, we face a problem as delicate and difficult, and as absorbing in its interest, as any which our research itself can raise. And the fine art of marshalling one's chaos of facts into lucid order is worth infinite pains to master.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We do not always take the pains, and one of the crying needs of scholarship is that they should be taken. Why, to be explicit, are doctoral dissertations, and articles in learned journals, and even books addressed *ad clerum*, with notable and distinguished exceptions, so often deadly reading? They often are, and one need make no bones about it. Just why the academic mind should be regarded as less susceptible to boredom than the lay mind, I do not know. I do know that I, whose mind, *ex hypothesi*, is academic, am sometimes moved to tears, if I could only shed them, by the flatness and lack of distinction and facile professional lingo of some of the things I am compelled to read. Yet a piece of learned exposition may, in its kind, be as luminous and urbane as a chapter of Cardinal Newman, or an opinion handed down by Mr. Justice Holmes. There are few things in the world more interesting than the disclosure of facts which illuminate and throw into fresh perspective a mass of other facts. And the results of research, however learned, may be presented, without shallowness or artifice, in lucid order, and with clarity of phrase, and even may at times possess the fascination of a tale. Our fatal blunder is to sit down, when our problem is solved, and let (as we say) the facts speak for themselves. There are few more mischievous fallacies. To us who have mastered their meaning, our facts do speak for themselves. To those for whom we are writing, their speech, which we have learned, must be interpreted. "There are," said the Apostle Paul, himself a past master of exposition—"there are so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and *he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me*." That indictment is sometimes terribly pertinent, I fear, to us. "They order this matter better in France," and in English the mathematicians and physicists are beating the humanists at their own game. To apply to results obtained through the rigid methods of science the principles of an art—that is a contribution never more needed than now. And it is a contribution infinitely worth our pains to make.

One of the very best books about that art—to be practical for a moment—was written about fifty years ago by a physiological psychologist. Few people seem to know it now; I wish more did. It is by George Henry Lewes, whom one first thinks of in connection with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

George Eliot, and the book was originally a series of articles in the *Fortnightly Review*, with the unappealing title: *Principles of Success in Literature.* In it occurs this sentence: "The greatness of an author consists in having a mind *extremely irritable*, and at the same time *stedfastly imperial.*" And Lewes, being a biologist, is using "irritable" in its physiological sense of "responsive to stimuli." What has his phrase to do with our problem of exposition?

Precisely what it had to do with Shakespeare, or Coleridge, or Keats, or Darwin, or has to do with Eddington or Jeans. It means, with its "extremely irritable," the utmost susceptibility to impressions; it means, with its "stedfastly imperial," a sovereign molding of them into form. You have first to *discover*, and then to *translate.* And the problem of exposition is a challenge to the exercise of your keenest faculties, and an adventure comparable both in its difficulty and in its engrossing interest to the enterprise of discovery which precedes it. For the essence of what I have called discovery is the perception of some clarity or order implicit in the confusion of phenomena; the business of what I have called translation is to impose another clarity and order upon the chaotic mass of observations and impressions through which we have reached our end. And that it is which is too often scamped.

I have just quoted a natural scientist and an apostle. It was a poet who more than a century ago stated succinctly why we fail. "We want," Shelley wrote in 1821, speaking not of poetry, but of political and economic problems ("concealed," as he says, "by the accumulation of facts")—"we want the creative faculty to imagine what we know." Translated into concrete terms that means, for us—I meet the problem in doctoral dissertations every year—this. Here we are, with our chaotic mass of facts, through which, in the sweat of our brow, we have slowly learned our way. We have lived with them, become saturated with them, until they are as familiar to *us* as the streets we daily walk. And our problem is to make them intelligible—and lucid, if we can—to readers who are not, as we are, permeated with the implications and associations of our particular congeries. But when we have lived with our own particular chaos for months, it may be for years, we forget with fatal ease that our readers are unfamiliar with the landmarks of anybody's chaos but their own. And the first requisite of effective exposition is the power

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of seeing with another's eyes—the eyes of our students or fellow scholars—the things which we have been seeing only with our own. We must possess, in a word, that creative faculty which *imagines* what it knows—the ability to stand outside the mass within which we are ourselves at home, and to see it, if not *sub specie æternitatis*, at least from our readers' or our hearers' point of view.

There is a pregnant remark of Amiel's—to add, now, to scientist, apostle, and poet, a professor of philosophy—which is much to the point. "To understand things," says Amiel, "we must have been once in them and then have come out of them. . . . He who is still under the spell, and he who has never felt the spell, are equally incompetent." Very well! To stand outside the chaos of massed observations in the implications of which you are steeped, and think through them with that intellectual detachment which alone permits their reduction to clarity and order, is an achievement beside which the arduousness of the research is sometimes as child's play. But the one may be an adventure as engrossing as the other. And, to speak frankly, unless one can catch in one's researches, and even in the effort to impart them, something at least akin to the spirit of adventure, the thing is dead. And the glory of teaching, in its turn, lies in the opportunity it offers to awaken and direct inquiring spirits.

There are eight lines of Goethe into which is compacted the essence of what I have tried to say. And I shall leave you them as an expression of the breath and finer spirit of the high enterprise before you.

Weite Welt und breites Leben,
Langer Jahre redlich Streben,
Stets geforscht und stets gegründet,
Nie geschlossen, oft geründet,
Aeltestes bewahrt mit Treue,
Freundlich aufgefaſstes Neue,
Heitern Sinn und reine Zwecke:
Nun, man kommt wohl eine Strecke——

"Well, one gets ahead a bit"—and one *does*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ballad of Resurrection Bar

WILLIAM ROSE BENÉT

WITH a rusted coat, a muffling beard,
A marvelous shapeless hat,
And red eyes blinking little and weird,
In Madison Square he sat.

Alas, the Garden long is gone
Though the pigeons still are there,
And Artemis hunts from dusk to dawn
No more o'er Madison Square!

But the benches line the walks in a row
And curve the paths in a ring,
And thither the weary walkers go
To sit and drowse in the Spring,

The funny old woman who nods her head,
The bats-in-the-belfry bum,
The barely-alive and the long-since-dead,
To Madison Square they come.

The campanile lifts above
A spear on the plum-blue night,
Its clock-face round as an apple of love,
Or a mimic moon, is bright.

He scratched a match on the seat of his pants,
He fired his stub of cigar,
And his soul was out on the seas of chance
Where the golden galleons are,

The golden galleons raked by Fate,
Scuttled by Destiny—
The tall ships sunk with their priceless plate
By the black flag off the key!

Poor lovers dazed in a dream went by,
Their laughter rippled the dusk—
But how could their languished eyes descry
The flame that flapped in a husk?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Or how could they know as they scuffled past
A dirty old tramp of the town,
The flag that once was nailed to the mast
Before the ship went down?

It was long ago for a dime or so
At a resurrection bar,
You could buy the man you used to know
To change with the man you are,

That the soul long bound in a scurvy prison
Might shatter its fetters to be
Alive an instant—the god re-risen
Stand up for a moment free.

But now all drink's for the well-to-do
Save the stuff that strikes you blind;
A gunman's racket through and through
If you're not of the gifted kind;

With a bank-account you can booze till dawn,
Will your gullet ease it down—
But where has the glorious Free Lunch gone
And the Biggest Beer in Town?

And where surcease for the Poor today,
Who most need surcease still?
They have stolen their drop of God away
To let the prosperous swill,

To let the yahoo take the town,
The gangster rule with his rod,
The robber laugh as the laws go down,
The hypocrite smirk and nod!

He hitched his waist-band knotted with string,
His sore lips puffed at the butt,
And he growled as the pangs went ravening
Like wolves through his hungry gut.

They talk of work and they talk of want,
And it's all as clear as day,
And it's all as old as the oldest cant—
For they know not what they say;

Yes, some may fall through lust or pride,
Through weakness many or few—
But skies are dark with the crucified,
For they know not what they do,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ballad of Resurrection Bar

And so they crouch and so they prate
And fear for their golden muck,
And call it shiftlessness or fate
That bows the backs of the ruck,

"Ah, hell!" he said, and he scratched his head
And spiered at a strolling cop.
"Time I scrammed to get me a bed,
Though I don't know how I'll flop

On just two cents!" Then the coughing took
His chest as it often will,
And he slumped and slumped as the racking shook
His soul; and then sat still,

His eyes awater, his mouth agape,
His vitals still awrench;
For he seemed to see a silvery shape
That towered above his bench.

It stood with wings like a jewl'ry store,
So bright it made you blink!
A sort of a glittering gown it wore
And it said, *"Do you want a drink?"*

His veins were water, his feet were lead,
The blaze of it made him weak.
His eyes were blanket-holes in his head.
And still he could not speak.

How he tottered up in Madison Square
He could not tell for love
Or money; or how they walked the air
Straight up to the clock above,

The clock that shines in the lighted tower,
The wisest clock in the town,
Arbiter of each tragic hour
On which the moon looks down!

It opened up, it seemed, like a door.
A brass rail shone afar,
And there was the sawdust on the floor,
And there was the old-time bar,

And there broad counters simply shook
With food like a festival—
But the customers craning round to look
Were the queerest thing of all;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For there was Dave who had long been dead,
And there was screw-eyed Kate,
And the Frisco Kid—and round each head
A thing like a silver plate,

Like a ring from Saturn neatly shaved!
And then broad laughter broke
And ran through the gang; and someone waved—
And it was Charley the Coke!

"Hey there, Alfalfa!" rang the guffaw.
But Alfalfa goggled around
To find his guide, who now he saw
Was nowhere to be found.

"Well, what the Hell—?" he forced a croak;
But The Limey cried, "No fear!"
"Lay off that, bo," Butch Kramer spoke,
"It's only Heaven, up here!"

"Step up! Step up!" urged Twisted Face,
"If you don't know where you are,
I'll say you've come to the real right place!
It's the Resurrection Bar!"

They girt him glittering all about.
One golden drink he downed . . .
And the god in his heart awoke with a shout . . .
And the Bar Keeper turned around . . .

. . . . . .

"All you get is bums, and here's one dead,"
Grumbled Patrolman Flynn,
As he stooped to the bench; and then he said,
"Well, at last God's run him in,

Though he really weren't worth a whoop in Hell;
Them bums, they none of them are!" . . .
Could he hear the rouses rise and swell
In the Resurrection Bar?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Philosopher-Saint: Spinoza

DEWITT H. PARKER
Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan

IN celebrating today the three-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Spinoza we do not pay honor to one who contributed much to the advancement of what I suspect many of our readers regard as scholarly research. For, unlike most of the greatest philosophers, Spinoza did not add notably to the elementary facts of science or of history. Along with Plotinus, Fichte, Schopenhauer, and Bergson, Spinoza was a pure philosopher. If, however, we understand by science, not knowledge of particular matters of fact alone but what is universal in all facts, together with the synthesis or order of facts as it forms in the mind under the total pressure of experience and information; then to contribute to philosophy is to contribute to science, and for his contribution we are all in Spinoza's debt. No one can philosophize, no one can give to his ideas final clarity and distinctness without reckoning with him. Moreover, if we measure a man's contribution to knowledge not only in terms of his discoveries but also in terms of the inspiration which he gave to other men in the pursuit of truth, Spinoza's contribution was of the greatest. To his contemporaries among the learned, Spinoza was a saint and a hero of the intellect in a day when the pursuit of truth was still a dangerous occupation for which one might die or be exiled or forfeit one's goods; and, after the cloud of misunderstanding and vilification which for a hundred years obscured his name had lifted, he became again a star beaconing from above to all engaged in this pursuit, from which the dangers of the past had vanished but to which new dangers, perhaps more insidious, threaten—of sloth from ease and prosperity, of weariness of mind, of temptation to exchange popularity for solid achievement, of distraction in a multifarious world too much with us.

It would be unfair to Spinoza, who believed that philosophy is a way of life to be practiced as well as a theory to be understood, to give no account of his character and career. Not that his philosophy, or any man's philosophy, is a product of mere temperament, like a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work of lyric art. Even if the justice of the assimilation of philosophy to art were admitted this would not follow, for no work of art can be understood apart from a tradition independent of temperament, and to tradition must be added, in the case of philosophy, the special problems of the subject matter and the influence of current scientific ideas. Nevertheless, since a philosophy is the resultant of the total pressure of experience and knowledge upon one mind, and this pressure is never the same upon two different minds, temperament, life-history, and what we call character play their part. And fortunately, although Spinoza's life was singularly unstirring and absorbed by his work, we possess enough details from contemporary and near contemporary sources to draw a fairly definite picture of the man and his manner of life, yet not enough perhaps to satisfy those who seek the intimate, all too intimate details.

That Spinoza was born a Jew, of parents who emigrated from Portugal in order to escape persecution, and that he was born in Amsterdam in 1632 and spent all his life in Holland, the refuge of free minds during the seventeenth century, is not without significance for his philosophy. He early became acquainted with the Talmud and with Jewish Medieval thought. As one of his biographers said:

> He showed from his childhood and in his younger years that nature had not been unkind to him. His quick fancy and his penetrating wit were easily perceived. Because he had a great mind to learn the Latin tongue they gave him at first a German master, but afterwards, in order to perfect himself in that language, he made use of the famous Vanden Ende, who taught it then in Amsterdam and practiced Physick at the same time. That man taught with good success and a great reputation; so that the richest merchants of the city intrusted him with the instruction of their children, before they found out that he taught his scholars something else besides Latin.

This something else that Vanden Ende taught is called by Spinoza's biographer, atheism; but to Colerus any sort of unorthodoxy was atheism, and what Spinoza may well have learned from Vanden Ende was only freedom of mind. Moreover, his acquaintance with Latin made possible the study of the works of Descartes who was to have such a powerful influence upon his thinking. The habit of free thinking joined with the habit of speaking his mind freely soon brought Spinoza into difficult relations with his own people, who were probably not so much shocked by his ideas as fearful for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reputation of their community and the privileges that had been accorded to it by the Dutch authorities. We are told that he was even offered a pension if he would conform, but in vain; Spinoza remained obdurate, and in 1656, when he was not quite twenty-four years old, formal excommunication was pronounced upon him. This entailed separation from his people and from the position of honor and prosperity which he might have won among them. But Spinoza seems to have anticipated this result and took the matter calmly. In order to secure a livelihood he learned the art of grinding lenses for optical instruments, "and succeeded so well that people came from all parts to buy them." During this time he was pursuing the study of philosophy and soon became the admired leader of a group of young and eager minded men. For their instruction he wrote his *Short Treatise on God, on Man and his Wellbeing*. The pattern of his life was now fixed. He had a means of livelihood, which being of a manual nature doubtless afforded him a healthful change from purely intellectual pursuits, and allowed him time for study and reflexion; and he had a circle of friends with whom he could exchange ideas. In 1661 he moved to Rhinsberg near Leiden, where began his correspondence with Henry Oldenburg, the first secretary of the Royal Society in London. A couple of years later he made another change of residence, to the suburbs of the Hague, and afterwards, in 1670, to the Hague itself where he spent his remaining years. But nothing was allowed to disturb the original plan of his life as it was fixed in his early manhood. His insight into his own destiny was unerring and unfaltering. Like the great majority of the most famous philosophers he never married and the only story of a love affair that we have, with Vanden Ende's learned daughter, is probably apocryphal. His loyalty to his chosen way of life was so great that not even the signal honor of a professorship at Heidelberg, offered him in 1673, could tempt him, although he was assured of the largest freedom in philosophizing, provided he did not disturb the established religion. In his letter of declination addressed to the Elector's secretary, Spinoza gave the following reasons for his decision:

> I think in the first place that I should abandon philosophical research if I consented to find time for teaching young students. I think in the second place that I do not know the limits within which the freedom of my philosophical teaching would be confined, if I am to avoid all appearance of dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turbing the publicly established religion. Religious quarrels do not arise so much from the ardent zeal for religion as from man's various dispositions and love of contradiction which causes them habitually to distort and condemn everything, however rightly it may be said. If I have experienced these results in my private and secluded station, how much more would I have to fear them after my elevation to this post of honor. Thus you see, distinguished sir, that I am not holding back in the hope of getting something better but through my love of quietness, which I think I can in some measure secure, if I keep away from lecturing in public.

There was perhaps another reason for his refusal, which he did not state—his ill health. He had been a victim of tuberculosis from his youth. Of this he died in February, 1677, in his forty-fifth year. The house where he spent his last days is still standing. Of it Renan said, "C'est d'ici peut-être que Dieu a été vu de plus près."

His manner of life is thus described by Colerus.

It is scarce credible how sober and frugal he was all the time. Not that he was reduced to so great a poverty as not to be able to spend more, if he had been willing; he had friends enough who offered him their purses and all manner of assistance; but he was naturally very sober and could be satisfied with little; and he did not care that people should think that he had lived even but once at the expense of other men. What I say about his sobriety and good husbandry may be proved by several small reconings, which have been found among his papers after his death. It appears by them that he lived a whole day upon a milk soup done with butter, which amounted to three pence, and upon a pot of bear of three half pence. Another day he ate nothing but gruel with raisins and butter, and that dish cost him four pence half penny. There are but two half pints of wine at most for one month to be found amongst those reconings, and though he was often invited to eat with his friends, he chose rather to live upon what he had at home, though it was never so little, than to sit down at a good table at the expense of another man. He was careful to cast up his accounts every quarter . . . and he would say sometimes to the people of the house that he was like the serpent who forms a circle with his tail in his mouth to denote that he had nothing left at the year's end. When he was tired he would often go down stairs to converse and smoke a pipe of tobacco, or remaining in his room, watch the spiders fight for a fly or observe their parts under the microscope.

And a still earlier biographer says of him:

Most of his time he spent in the investigation of the nature of things, in setting his discoveries in order, and in communicating them to his friends. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had little time for recreation. So strong was his passion for the pursuit of truth that, according to the testimony of those with whom he lived, he sometimes kept to the house for three whole months.

The impression of loneliness and isolation which these accounts give must be modified by the realization that Spinoza was visited by distinguished people in the Hague and by foreigners, and, so great was his reputation, he kept in touch by correspondence with such men as Oldenburg, Huygens, and Leibnitz.

That Spinoza was a man of saintly character is the universal voice of all who knew him. By a saint we mean, I should suppose, a man whose devotion to the highest pursuits is like a flame that consumes all interest in lower things. In Spinoza's case this purity of mind led to an almost unbelievable disinterestedness. "He had such a great propensity not to do anything for the sake of being regarded and admired by the people," wrote his earliest biographer, "that when dying he requested that his name should not be put on his *Ethics*, saying that such affectations were unworthy of a philosopher." And again, "As he did not enjoy good health at any time during the whole course of his life, he had learned to suffer since his most tender youth, therefore no one ever had a better understanding of that branch of knowledge. Yet he sought consolation only in himself, and if he was susceptible to any sorrow, it was to the sorrow of others." Along with this highmindedness went, as one would expect, an extreme generosity and simplicity in his dealings with his fellow men, in particular with the unlearned people with whom he lived—a matter of much remark by his biographers. Yet for all his saintliness and learning, Spinoza was no unapproachable pedant but a merry companion, renowned for the wit and good sense of his conversation. He who was always so close to death has reminded us that the wise man will think least of all of death, and that wisdom is a meditation on life, not on death. The following quotation from the *Ethics* gives us, perhaps, an idea of the things he enjoyed in the rare hours when not engaged in his work.

I say it is the part of a wise man to refresh and recreate himself with moderate and pleasant food and drink, and also with perfumes, with the soft beauty of growing plants, with dress, with music, with the theatres and the like, such as every man may make use of without injury to his neighbor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The courtesy and refinement of his manners were noted by his contemporaries. When he went to Utrecht to meet the Prince of Conde who had summoned him, we are told:

> The crowd of courtiers did not awe our philosopher. He had a courteousness that was more like that of the court than like that of a commercial city such as he was born in. Although this kind of life was utterly opposed to his principles and his taste, he submitted to it with as much complacency as the courtiers themselves. . . . He had a quality which I esteem all the more because it is rare in a philosopher. He was extremely tidy, and whenever he went out there was something about his clothes which usually distinguishes a gentleman from a pedant.

And no one, I think, can look at the pictures of him that have come down to us without detecting a certain lordliness of bearing, the expression of that sense, common to great men, of the divine right of genius. When Albert Burgh wrote and asked him how he knew that his philosophy was the best among all that had ever been taught in the world, he replied that he did not presume that he had found the *best* philosophy, but that he knew that he understood the *true* philosophy.

Besides the *Short Treatise on God, on Man and his Wellbeing* already mentioned, Spinoza wrote three important works. Chief of these, is, of course, the *Ethics*, in which the whole of his philosophy is contained. The so-called geometrical method of exposition employed, in imitation of Euclid's *Elements*, with definitions, axioms, postulates, and propositions, seems to the modern reader barbarous and unnecessary, and is taken seriously by no one who is informed as to the arbitrariness of the distinction between postulates and theorems; but Spinoza, impressed like all his contemporaries with the mathematics and mathematical methods of his day, doubtless believed that his thought was more cogently expressed in this form, and that he really did prove his propositions. Fortunately there are the introductions, notes, and appendices, not in the geometrical style, which contain some of his most pregnant ideas, clothed in a memorable terseness and vividness of language. But I am not sure that the geometrical style has not given to the *Ethics* a certain charm of the difficulty overcome as one threads one's way as through a labyrinth from proposition to proposition and from proof to proof. Supplementary to the *Ethics* is the unfinished *Treatise on the Improvement of*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Understanding, commenced a few years earlier, which contains very important ideas on methodology and epistemology. It is interesting also as revealing in its opening sentences Spinoza's dominantly ethical approach to philosophy. He wrote:

> After experience had taught me that all the usual surroundings of social life are vain and futile, seeing that none of the objects of my fears contained in themselves anything either good or bad, except in so far as the mind is affected by them, I finally resolved to enquire whether there might be some real good having the power to communicate itself, which would affect the mind singly to the exclusion of all else, whether in fact there might be anything of which the discovery and attainment would enable me to enjoy continuous, supreme, and unending happiness.

Last among his great works is the *Theological-Political Treatise*, which Spinoza did not venture to print under his own name. This work is partly an examination of Scripture and partly a ringing defense of freedom of thought and expression in a commonwealth. In it he proclaimed that it is the purpose of government to free men's minds of fear and that acts, not opinions, are indictable; and by proposing, as a rule for the interpretation of Scripture, that every passage should be studied in the light of its language and history, he prepared the way for the so-called higher criticism of the Bible. His lesser works comprise a re-statement of the Cartesian philosophy in the geometrical manner, a Hebrew grammar, a long lost treatise on the rainbow, and an unfinished political treatise, based on the *Leviathan* of Hobbes, but defending democracy as the best form of government. Here he slily proposes, in order to save the country from too frequent wars, that those who govern shall receive their emoluments out of a percentage tax on foreign trade. Of all his books, only two, the *Principles of the Cartesian Philosophy* and the *Theological-Political Treatise*, were published during his lifetime.

The philosophy of Spinoza is the classical monistic system of modern times, the model for all similar systems, to which philosophers by profession and philosophers not by profession return again and again, re-expressing its insights in their own language and with such modifications as seem necessary owing to the changing experience and increasing knowledge of later years, but never varying in any important way its central theme. Into the construction of this system went the entire intellectual heritage of Spinoza: Christian and Jewish scho-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lasticism and mysticism, especially the thought of Maimonides and the lore of the Talmud; the speculations of early Renaissance writers such as Bruno, Telesius, and Leone Hebreo; the empiricism of Bacon and the rationalism of Descartes and Hobbes. It has been shown, in fact, that there is not a significant thought of Spinoza that cannot be found in the work of predecessors whom he must have read or known at second hand. The originality of Spinoza did not consist therefore in the novelty of his ideas but in the unique pattern into which he cast them. And the strength of his system depends very largely upon this fact that it summed up the thought of five hundred years, weaving together such seemingly inconsistent strands as mysticism, empiricism, and rationalism; and reconciling the intuitions of Medieval scholasticism with the science of the Renaissance.

In the metaphysical philosophy of Spinoza there are two great motifs—the unity of substance and the substitution of mathematical necessity for final causes and the efficacy of the will. To the ordinary way of perceiving, which Spinoza called imagination, the world is a collection of separate, independent things—this book, this star, this man, and the like. But as soon as one comes to know much about anything one discovers that while it is possible to go on imagining it as independent, one cannot think or conceive it to be so, for it reveals itself as dependent upon every other thing, and, in the end, one reaches the insight that there is only one thing—which Spinoza called indifferently, God or Nature. All the seemingly separate things are then seen to be but modes or modifications, limited and transitory, of a single eternal substance, which is unaffected by their changes. Hence all distinctions of time and place and number apply only to modes, as they are apprehended by the imagination, not to substance when it is understood by the reason, which sees everything "under a certain form of eternity."

If now we enquire what is the nature of this substance, Spinoza's answer is that it has infinite attributes, but that the human mind can apprehend only two of these; namely, mind and extension. There is a physical and a mental aspect to everything, or to put the matter in another way, the universe is at once an infinite mind and an infinite thing. This implies that all individuals are, though in different degrees, animated, and that the order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things. There is some difficulty in in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terpreting Spinoza's thought in regard to the relation of the two attributes, but it seems clear that he would insist on their unity in the one substance, for, to use his own metaphor, mind and extension are like two languages in which a single meaning is expressed. You cannot mix the vocabularies and make sense, but you can make the same sense in either. This single meaning, this "thing-in-itself" as Kant would have called it, is further characterized by Spinoza as a conatus, endeavor or striving, which when we are conscious we know in ourselves as desire. Through this doctrine of the one substance with the two attributes, Spinoza brought order into Cartesianism, and by calling substance God, he continued the tradition of scholasticism.

But in his critique of final causes and his attack upon the notion of freedom of the will Spinoza broke sharply with philosophical tradition and showed the influence upon his thinking both of Baconian empiricism and of the so-called mathematical method. In the Appendix to the first book of the *Ethics* he condemns as the grossest anthropomorphism all attempts to attribute to Nature or to God—for God and Nature are the same—the notion of purpose, or to distinguish within nature good from evil, beauty from deformity, order from disorder. Because men in their need act for the sake of what is useful to them and order their lives in view of results, they ascribe the same procedure to God, and when called upon to explain earthquakes, wars, and diseases, they take refuge in what Spinoza called the argument from human ignorance. But how can God act in view of an end when he lacks nothing, and how can good and evil, which have no meaning apart from human desire, have validity for an infinite being? "The doctrine of final causes," he declared, "might well have sufficed to conceal the truth from the human race from all eternity if mathematics had not furnished another standard of verity in considering solely the essence and properties of figures without regard to their final causes." And just as the illusion of final causes arises because men in the eagerness of their needs seek to know about things only what is useful to themselves and then think of this utility as the essence and sole nature of things, being ignorant all the while of their true causes and mode of operation; so the illusion of freedom arises from the fact that men are aware of their desires and volitions, but in their ignorance never even dream of the causes which dispose them so to wish and desire. "Thus an infant believes that of its own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free will it desires milk, an angry child believes that it freely desires vengeance, a timid child believes that it freely desires to run away, further a drunken man believes that he utters from the free decision of his mind words which when he is sober, he would willingly have withheld." In place of final causes and the efficacy of the will, Spinoza put mathematical necessity. Every occurrence, he taught, follows from its cause—in the end, from the nature of the universe, with the same necessity that the equality of the sum of the angles of a triangle to two right angles follows from the definition of a triangle. Spinoza seems to have loved the triangle for it is his oft repeated example of a necessary system of elements.

To us, who are familiar with the mathematical determinism of a Laplace and are witnesses of the revival of Pythagoreanism in the current philosophy of nature, there is nothing startling in these ideas, but to Spinoza's contemporaries they sounded like the most shocking impiety. It was on account of them that, until the new reading of his doctrine by Lessing and Goethe, he was regarded as the typical atheist. He was thought completely to annul the distinction between good and evil, higher and lower, and in ascribing to God the causation of both righteous and wicked acts, to destroy God's moral nature. The religious basis of his philosophy seemed to be betrayed in such a sentence as this:

> To those who ask why God did not so create all men that they should be governed solely by reason, I give no answer but this, because matter was not lacking to him for the creation of every degree of perfection from highest to lowest, or more strictly, because the laws of his nature are so vast as to suffice for the production of everything conceivable by an infinite intellect.

Yet there are passages in Spinoza's writings, and especially in his correspondence, in which he showed that, although he persisted to the end in refusing to transfer to God or Nature moral and esthetic distinctions which depend on the special interests of men, he was far from denying the obvious fact that the kind of life lived by one creature is different from the kind of life lived by another. Thus in a letter to Blyenburgh he wrote:

> I would have it observed that, although the actions of the good and of the wicked, like all things that are, necessarily flow from God's eternal decrees and laws, yet they do not differ from one another in degree only, but in es-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sence. A mouse no less than an angel and sorrow no less than joy, depend on God, yet a mouse is not a kind of angel, neither is sorrow a kind of joy.

And in another place he wrote:

The wicked knowing not God are as instruments in the hands of a workman, serving unconsciously and perishing in the using; the good on the other hand serve consciously, and in serving become more perfect.

To many minds, moreover, as to Goethe, Spinoza's renunciation of the human tendency to ascribe to nature the limited interests of men has seemed not impiety but highmindedness, a freshening extension of the intellectual horizon, a "heaven in the understanding."

Thus in his metaphysical system, the merest sketch of which is attempted in the foregoing pages, Spinoza sought, with a magnificent boldness and sweep of vision, to reconcile religion with the science of his day. The parallel with the efforts of such contemporaries as Eddington, Jeans, and Whitehead is, I think, striking. Common to them and to Spinoza is the postulation of a unitary activity as the ground of experienced change, and the conviction that mathematics is the sole instrument for the intellectual and practical mastery of the events that spring from this ground. The chief difficulty that I personally find in Spinoza's system, is to explain why the conatus, which is of the stuff of desire, should express itself mathematically rather than teleologically. Two ways are open for the avoidance of this difficulty—either to try to dispense with the conatus altogether, when a mathematical positivism results, with no religious implications; or to revise the conception of mathematics, viewing mathematics as a pure symbolism for the expression of uniformities, statistical rather than real, within which the alleged necessity is no necessity, but tautology, whereby the more metaphysical part of Spinozism may be retained and reconciled with scientific method and knowledge.

Spinoza's moral theory is partly a deduction from his first principles and partly a construction based on a singularly detached and objective study of human nature. He writes:

Most writers on the emotions and on human conduct seem to be treating rather of matters outside nature than natural phenomena following nature's general laws. They appear to conceive man as situated in nature as a kingdom within a kingdom, for they believe that he disturbs rather than follows na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture's order, that he has absolute control over his actions, and that he is determined solely by himself. Such persons will doubtless think it strange that I should attempt to treat of human vice and folly geometrically, and should wish to set forth with rigid reasoning those matters which they cry out against as repugnant to reason, frivolous, absurd, and dreadful. However, such is my plan . . . I shall consider human actions and desires exactly as though I were concerned with lines, planes, and solids.

Studied objectively in this fashion, man's nature is seen to be essentially the same as the nature of all things; namely, a conatus, or endeavor to preserve itself and to advance in perfection of being; that is, in the range, the scope of its power of action. Viewed subjectively, the conatus is the same as desire. The conatus of Spinoza is clearly the analogue of the will to live, the will to power, the *élan vital*, the *libido* of later writers.

It is the fate of man as but a part of nature which surpasses him infinitely in power that his endeavor is continually checked and determined not from within himself but from outside by the things that impinge upon him. In so far as this is the case, man is passive and his mental state is called an emotion. The emotions are the signs of our bondage, functions of our involvment in our environment. Since, moreover, for Spinoza there is no essential difference between desire, emotion, and idea, the Cartesian distinction between will and knowledge and the entire faculty psychology of tradition being rejected—one of the most interesting points of his psychology—he was able to identify emotions with confused ideas. For an inadequate or confused idea is one that reveals rather the state of the body in its relations to an object than the nature of the object as it is in itself. Most of our ideas are of this sort, as, for example, all of our visual perceptions, which show rather our perspective relations to objects than the real size and shape of objects themselves. An emotion likewise reveals chiefly the perturbation of the body as it is affected by an object. It thus tells us more about ourselves than about things, and even of ourselves it tells us simply how we are influenced by things outside us. Mental derangement only carries to the limit the falsity of perspective characteristic of all emotion. Our common lot is thus one of slavery, "to be driven about by external causes, and like waves of the sea stirred by contrary winds, to sway hither and thither, not knowing to what our fate will bring us."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now for Spinoza the ethical problem is simply how to find a way to freedom from this bondage. Freedom consists in acting in accordance with one's own intrinsic nature, rather than acting under the determination of external things. It implies liberating the conatus from involvement in the environment or, what comes to the same, releasing oneself from slavery to the emotions. This freedom can obviously not be attained by severing oneself from all relations to other things, which would mean death. No. There must be some way of liberation that leaves man within life, within his environment. The way proposed by Spinoza is the way of the philosopher—understanding is the road to liberation; understanding of self and of one's relations to the environment, the supreme affirmation of the conatus in the face of the world. And since emotion is the subjective side of our entanglement in things, to understand our relations is to understand our emotions. But, in Spinoza's own words, "an emotion which is a passivity ceases to be passive as soon as we form a clear and distinct idea of it." Yet the mere substitution of true ideas for false ones does not suffice for the domination of the emotions; only an emotion can control an emotion. Understanding must release a new interest—an interest in complete, rational self-direction—which Spinoza called *fortitudo*. Hence insight does not destroy emotion but remodels it into an expression of one's own nature when otherwise it is a mere passive letting of oneself go under the pressure of circumstances. Virtue is nothing else than freedom of soul, living with open eyes, under full central control.

So conceived and practiced virtue is blessedness, its own reward. Through it man attains the largest possible scope for his action, the greatest perfection. Spinoza had nothing except scorn for those who would justify virtue through the hope of external rewards or the fear of punishment here or in a life hereafter, or who suppose that without this hope or this fear men would "return to their own inclinations, controlling everything in accordance with their lusts, and desiring to obey fortune rather than themselves. Such a course appears to me," he wrote, "not less absurd than if a man, because he did not believe that by wholesome food he can sustain his body forever, should wish to cram himself with poisons and deadly fare, or if because he sees that the mind is not eternal and immortal, he should prefer to be out of his mind altogether and to live without the use of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason." Or still more strongly perhaps, in the following: "Anyone who clearly saw that by committing crimes he would really enjoy a more perfect and better life than he would by the practice of virtue, would be foolish if he did not act on his convictions, for with such a perverse human nature as his, crime would be virtue."

To some readers of the *Ethics*, it may seem as though Spinoza's account of morality is too individualistic in its starting point. It cannot indeed be denied that Spinoza, like Hobbes, begins his analysis with a concept of man as an individual, seeking primarily his own self-preservation; but as he proceeds he modifies and corrects this conception, until at the end we find him not only recognizing the social character of man, but insisting furthermore on the possibility of union with the Being he called God or Nature.

> We can never arrive at doing without all external things for the preservation of our existence so as to have no relations with things outside ourselves. And if we consider our mind we see that our intellect would be more imperfect if mind were alone and could understand nothing but itself. Of things outside ourselves none can be discerned more excellent than those which are in entire agreement with ourselves. But nothing can be more in harmony with the nature of any given thing than other individuals of the same species; therefore for man in the preservation of his being and the enjoyment of the rational life there is nothing more useful than his fellow man who is led by reason. Further, as we know nothing that is more excellent than a man who is led by reason, no one can better display the power of his skill than in so training men that they will come at last to live under the dominion of their reason.

And he adds, "Minds are not conquered by force, but by love and highmindedness."

The crowning phase of Spinoza's philosophy, reminiscent of Plato, is rightly called mystical, and like all mysticism is difficult, perhaps impossible, to put into other words than the mystic's own, if indeed it be possible to express it at all, for what Spinoza says about it is far from clear. But something like this is probably what he meant, restated in large measure in his own unforgetable language. If we arrive finally at the most complete knowledge possible, which Spinoza called intuitive insight, knowing things not merely in the ordinary way of science through general laws but envisaging them each in its individuality, yet under the form of eternity, that is, as having its unique and necessary place in nature; then there arises in the mind

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what Spinoza called a true acquiescence, for we now see our own destiny as an inevitable part of the universal plan and ourselves as one with the universe. This acquiescence, however, is no mere passive resignation, but active love of the Universe, for we love that which to know gives us joy. This is the *amor intellectualis Dei*, the intellectual love of God. And while most of what we are must perish, being dependent on the shifting circumstances of our physical existence, *non ominis moriar*, that part of us which knows and loves the truth is eternal, since truth is imperishable.

Space does not permit an adequate survey of the influence of Spinoza. In the field of philosophy this has been immense. Partly through his contact with Spinoza and his ideas Leibnitz was stimulated to formulate his contrasting pluralistic system, its most formidable rival. Then followed a hundred years of obloquy during which Spinoza was regarded as the arch destroyer of the faith. But after the revaluation which took place at the close of the eighteenth century, largely through the enthusiasm of Lessing, Jacobi, and Goethe, he was hailed as the greatest speculative genius of modern times. Schelling avowed himself a Spinozist and Hegel acknowledged his indebtedness to him. As already remarked, every subsequent monistic system is a reworking of his ideas, down to Bradley and Bosanquet of our own times. All the principles of this philosophy are in Spinoza —the unity of all things, the dependence of each thing upon all other things, the degrees of truth and reality.

But the influence of Spinoza has not been confined to philosophers in the more technical sense of that term. His influence on men of letters has been equally powerful. Perhaps nothing could be more fitting in this memorial, in order to indicate the kind of influence he had, than to quote from one who died just two hundred years after Spinoza's birth. In his *Dichtung und Wahrheit* Goethe wrote:

> What the book [Spinoza's *Ethics*] may have given to me or what I may have put into it of my own it is impossible for me to say. Enough that I found here that which stilled the emotions—a wide and free prospect over the physical and moral world disclosed itself before me. But what chiefly drew me to Spinoza was the boundless unselfishness that shone forth in every sentence. That marvellous sentence, He who truly loves God must not expect that God should love him in return, with all the propositions that support it, all the consequences that flow from it, was the burden of all my thoughts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

College Music Goes Highbrow

JOHN TASKER HOWARD

IN the eyes of the conservative alumnus the average undergraduate is a hopeless radical. The old grad worshipped tradition when he was in college, blindly; the fact that a custom was twenty-five years old was sufficient reason for almost anything. When changes were made—abolition of hazing and other sophomoric diversions—they were generally inaugurated by the faculty. The student was for keeping things as they were. Hence rises the dismay of the graduate when he finds the youngsters themselves throwing overboard the customs he cherished most fondly. Small wonder he thinks they're degenerating and the campus becoming a Greenwich Village. Does the undergraduate help to keep alive the football tradition? Hardly. He may still remain in town for the games, but not to root and cheer as lustily as his forefathers did. No, the commercialization of intercollegiate sports is not to be blamed on the students; the alumni provide the bull market for football tickets. The student may catch or inherit some of the rah-rah spirit but he is rapidly becoming a passive observer at the big games, transferring his interest in sports to the intramural contests where more of the less skillful may participate.

Few alumni can understand this change, and when the seniors at Williams recently agitated the abolition of class-day as a meaningless ceremonial an explosion was inevitable. Here no doubt the youngsters were going a bit far, yet it is well to remember that the young men and women in our colleges are making a new appraisal of values and demanding a sensible reason for what they are expected to do.

The conservative alumnus overlooks some highly important phases of the situation, particularly in regard to cultural developments in the students' own campus activities. Dramatic clubs have graduated from the "Box and Cox" class; they have stepped into line with the little theatre movement and are generally presenting plays worth the time and effort involved in their production. Equally significant are the changes in college music, not only in the music departments and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courses offered as part of the curriculum but also in the musical activities organized by the undergraduates themselves. It is this field that I propose to examine, both as it affects the students and as it demonstrates the attitude of the alumni toward the many changes on the campus.

While examining the bulky scrap book of a Yale graduate I found the program of a musical club's concert given in 1897. Here are a few of its items. First on the program is a *Handicap March* by the Banjo Club. I can hear them now, twang-twanging away with as much variety in their playing as you may find in the performance of a riveting machine. Next came a college song by the Glee Club, then a topical song, and after that the first group came to a close with something called *Tutti Frutti.* After its brief rest the Banjo Club came forward with a *Chinatown March,* followed by a sentimental ballad. Then the Mandolin Club made its appearance with *The Nightingale and the Rose* and a pair of novelty selections. The Banjo Club appeared once more, this time with a medley, and the program ended with a number of college songs, with "Alma Mater" for a climax.

This type of program was by no means confined to the gay "nineties." It was still the fashion when I was in college fifteen years later and for some time thereafter. We really thought it was good, and I suppose it was, in its way. No one took it seriously. It was fun to be in the musical clubs. The annual trips were great events—concerts followed by dances, and the club members entertained at the homes of hostesses and their charming daughters. Musically the whole business may have been trivial but who expected anything else of a college musical club?

Consider now a program given by the Yale Glee Club on its Christmas holiday trip in 1930.

PART I

1. English Folk-Songs
   - Down Among the Dead Men
   - Gentle Johnny
   - John Peel
2. Christmas Music
   - Christians, Hark . . . . . French Carol
   - Ave Maria . . . . . Vittoria

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Tenor Solos
   Passing By ..... Purcell
   The Heart of a Man ..... from *The Beggar's Opera*
4. The Testament (Student Song of Heidelberg) ..... Marschner

PART II

1. The Bell-Man ..... Cecil Forsyth
2. American Folk-Songs
   Frog Went a-Courtin' (Kentucky Mountain)
   Root Hog or Die (Cowboy)
   The Battle of Jericho (Negro)
3. Plantation Melodies
   Never Let Him Catch You
   Bones Come a Knittin'
   Keep in the Middle of the Road
4. Bygone Ballads (1843–1854)
5. College Songs
   Integer Vitæ
   Antoinette Berby
   All at Once
6. Finale from *The Gondoliers* ..... Sullivan

The importance of the difference between these two programs lies in the fact that the students have free choice in the matter. It is their glee club; they may sing whatever they please. When Marshall Bartholomew first started to coach the Yale singers, ten years ago, he lacked enough candidates for a club of thirty members. That was for the old type of glee club. In the fall of 1931, 536 students applied for membership in a club that accommodates one hundred. One hundred and thirty-seven were freshmen (16 per cent of the entire class) and of these, 126 had enjoyed previous musical experience and training in preparatory school. The increased enrolment was for the new type of glee club. Such figures provide a fairly adequate answer to the man who claims that the faculty is forcing "high-brow" music on unwilling students, or to the alumnus who declared in a letter to the press: "Give the kids half a show, and they'll put on a living, American, undergraduate concert. They like it and they'll make the alumni like it. They don't want to sing about red, red roses, and 'Hey, Ninny [*sic*] No' any more than you want to hear them."

Nor may we overlook the incident of a football star in one of the major Eastern universities, a husky individual who approached the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glee club director at the beginning of his senior year. He explained that he had played football in preparatory school, on the freshman team, and for two seasons on the 'varsity. He confessed that he had never really liked it, but since he had the proper physique and the necessary speed, football had always been expected of him. For his last year in college he thought it was only just that he be allowed to gratify his secret craving, a desire to sing. There had never been time before, and therefore he proposed this year to give up football, if he could be admitted to the glee club. Here was a ticklish matter for the glee club director to decide. The lad had a good voice and knew how to use it. But the coach was a cautious individual, and since he could see the scandal that such an unprecedented victory for the arts would cause he finally advised the young man to consider himself a sacrifice to tradition and keep on with his football to the bitter end.

The average alumnus will always grumble about campus changes. He enjoyed certain rites in his own day and he now gains a vicarious pleasure from thinking of his successors as they perform the same ceremonials. Yet it might be assumed that any graduate of a college or university would welcome cultural progress on the campus. Not, however, in this decade. The futility of such an assumption is shown by an amazing correspondence printed in *The New York Evening Post* during the month of January, 1931, following the Christmas concert of the Yale Glee Club, when it rendered the program previously cited.

Of twenty letters written to *The Post*, thirteen condemned the "reformed" glee clubs, and only seven supported the changed policies. The supporters included one undergraduate and three recent graduates, while the thirteen consisted entirely of older alumni and an occasional outside observer. The most remarkable feature of the entire controversy was the statement of the editor of *The Post* that "a college glee club should sing college songs for the college audiences to whom alone it can have any real appeal." In the first of two editorials this editor wrote:

> College boys are not professional singers. The Mendelssohn and other choral societies meet a fine public need. But the undergraduate should not be called upon to live up to their standards of excellence. The undergraduate should express and control his own music just as he should express and control his own football.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More than that, the college glee club with college tunes and college humor and college tenderness fills a niche in life that is worth the filling. Perhaps it is all sophomoric, it is all adolescent. But this phase of life exists, and however unimportant it may seem musically, nevertheless it deserves expression. . . . Its little definite message to the hearts of collegians should not be blurred by the introduction of set outside pieces which mean nothing whatever, academically speaking. . . .

As for us, we just simply don't go to glee club concerts anymore. They are hybrids. They are artistically wrong. They don't do the thing that they are supposed to do and the thing which is their only justification. They don't express the life of a college as revealed in music. They are a bore. . . .

When the editor of a leading metropolitan daily fails to be convinced that the modern glee club is in any way preferable to the "Bull Frog on the Bank" variety, something is wrong with our cultural standards. One correspondent, a Syracuse graduate of 1927, replied that "college men have outgrown the musical taste of the 'nineties' —audiences and editors must do likewise." A Harvard alumnus of 1921 wrote: "The glee club concerts may be a bore to you, but they were not to the undergraduates of Harvard and Radcliffe, who in my day stood in throngs in the yard to listen to the glee club sing classical music from the steps of the Widener Library during the mellow evenings of May." One commentator observed that the sole purpose of a college glee club was "to provide alumni at near and distant points with their only link to their own undergraduate days." We might reply that if our only aim in sending our sons to college is to offer graduates a reminder of their former trivialities, we may better save our money in these days of depression. Moreover, the alumni are free to follow the suggestion of a one year's graduate, who urged the editor of *The Post* to attend any of the so-called college movies, where he would find the desired atmosphere in the presentation of college life "as a continual daisy chain of quartets 'neath the elms; ukeleles; engirded, voluptuous women; caddish upperclassmen; and last minute touchdowns."

Possibly the students do have a debt to those who have gone before them but its proper discharge does not consist in singing foolish songs. If the undergraduates want to go highbrow, that's their business, and we may call them effeminate, degenerate, or whatever we please, as long as we leave them alone to develop their cultural taste with an intelligence sadly lacking in their parents.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judged by the standards of the concert hall, the 1930 Yale program is far from highbrow. It is merely sane, containing a well-balanced contrast between the light and serious. It may be a stiff dose for the Babbitts among the alumni, but the sooner our colleges stop being run for the benefit of these gentlemen the better, not only for music, but for the good of our otherwise immortal souls.

The change that has come in the field of college music is one of the most drastic that has affected campus life. If there are any of the old style musical clubs left I don't know of them. The modern glee clubs range from a male or women's chorus as strictly devoted to the music of the masters as the Harvard Glee Club, to organizations that strike a happy medium between concert music and their own college songs. The mandolin and banjo clubs are practically extinct, replaced by symphony orchestras for serious music, and at the other end of the scale by jazz bands which can compete with professionals. In the latter field it is profitable to consider the case of Hubert P. Valee, Ph.B., Yale, 1927. Mr. Valee was turned down for the Yale Glee Club while an undergraduate. To satisfy his appetite for melody he developed his gift for saxaphone playing and crooning by organizing a small group of jazz players who called themselves the "Connecticut Yankees." Since graduation Mr. Valee has done very well for himself, if not for the general public.

The college orchestra of today is far from the joke it was in my student days. As yet I have been unable to banish from my ears the tooting and scraping that prefaced the performances of the dramatic club, but perhaps I may eventually forget such dismal noises if I may hear a few performances by the symphony orchestras of Columbia, Harvard, or Northwestern, or the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Utah, California, Washington, Kansas, Nebraska, or Iowa. In some instances students have been known to group together for playing chamber music, the summit of highbrowism, and to the music lover the height of musical enjoyment. In my time such vices were indulged secretly if at all.

Don't suppose that the change in musical standards has come suddenly, that all of the college students in the nation decided overnight that they must improve their taste. The movement has come from a gradual development, led shrewdly and subtly by a handful of patient leaders, men who have known that the value of education lies in al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowing students to make their own discoveries. Credit for the improvement may be awarded largely to Harvard, or, more specifically, to an individual at Harvard. When in 1919 the Harvard Glee Club announced that it had definitely turned its back on "They Kissed, I Saw Them Do It," and other minor diversions, it was merely responding to a ten year campaign conducted unobtrusively by its director, Archibald Davison. When he was first asked to coach the glee club Dr. Davison was leader of the chapel choir. For some time he had been improving the type of music sung in chapel, and those singers who belonged to both the choir and the glee club were fertile soil for a gradual introduction of good music into the club repertoire. The decision to renounce the trivial, when it came, was entirely voluntary on the part of the students, and no one was as surprised as the director that it came so quickly and so unconditionally.

It must nevertheless be known that Harvard is but following tradition in its comparatively recent policy. The original Harvard Glee Club was founded in 1858 for the express purpose of singing good music, and its early programs included works by Cherubini, Mozart, Mendelssohn, and others of their kind. Gradually college songs found their way into their programs and in time predominated, but the preponderance of lighter moments was not part of the original charter.

Since its reversion to first intentions the glee club from Cambridge has become one of the foremost male choruses in the world. It has toured annually to the principal concert centers of this country and has made several trips abroad. It has clearly demonstrated its ability to be enjoyed by a considerably larger public than the "college audiences to whom alone it can have any real appeal." It has frequently appeared with the symphony orchestras of Boston and other cities.

The Harvard Glee Club's excellence as a singing organization is to my mind a secondary consideration. The matter of first importance is that the young singers really like what they sing. Their participation is neither passive nor perfunctory. Proof may be found in the fact that people generally sing what they please in moments of relaxation. When the youths from the Harvard Glee Club wait for a train at midnight they amuse themselves with Bach and Palestrina; and if that isn't conclusive evidence that they like such music I am ready to admit that there is no Harvard Glee Club, and that Harvard is located at New Haven, or even at Princeton, New Jersey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

College Music Goes Highbrow

If Harvard alone had elevated its musical taste there might be little to talk about for it could easily be remarked that Harvard is Harvard, always a bit different from other colleges. But the movement is nation wide, and while few have gone the whole way and confined themselves so exclusively to the finest music, practically every college glee club in the country has improved the character of its programs. Many of them, like Yale, have achieved a balance between fine choral music and the better college songs. And what is most significant, there are more glee clubs than there used to be.

Princeton can hardly be accused of over-preciousness in its customs or in its attitudes yet its glee club has come into the front rank in its programs. On several occasions it has assisted Leopold Stokowski in his modernist experiments—in the premier performances of Stravinsky's *Œdipus Rex* and Schoenberg's *Gurre-Lieder*.

Consider this list from Old Nassau, rendered in Proctor Hall during the season of 1929–30.

EIGHT CENTURIES OF THE ART SONG

I. *Glee Club*
   a. Summertime (German) Minnesingers
      attributed to Neidhard von Reuenthal (13th Century)
   b. The Nightingale Song (French) Troubadours
      attributed to Chatelaine de Coucy (12th Century)
   c. The Agincourt Song (English 15th Century)

II. *Songs from the Crusades* (Baritone Solo)
   a. Li departir de la douce contree (French 13th Century)
   b. Siegneurs Sachez (French 13th Century)
      attributed to Thibaut de Champagne

III. *Glee Club*
   a. Sombre Woods (Italian 17th Century) . . . . . Lully
   b. Where'er Ye Walk (German 18th Century) . . . . . Handel
   c. Hark, Jolly Shepherds (English Madrigal 16th Century) . . . Morley

IV. *Art Songs from Italy* (Baritone Solo)
   a. Tanto Sospiro (18th Century) . . . . . Bencini
   b. Presto, Presto (17th Century) . . . . . Mazzaferrata

V. *Glee Club*
   a. Thou Art Repose (Austrian) . . . . . Schubert
   b. The Way of the World (Norwegian) . . . . . Grieg

VI. *Art Songs from Germany* (Baritone Solo)
   a. Die Lotusblume (19th Century) . . . . . Schumann
   b. Meine Liebe ist Grun . . . . . Brahms

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VII. *Glee Club*

a. Morning Hymn (German 19th Century) . . . . . Henschel
b. The Bells (French 20th Century) . . . . . Debussy
c. Gypsy Song (Bohemian 19th Century) . . . . . Dvorak

VIII. *Art Songs from America* (20th Century) (Baritone Solo)

a. A Song for Lovers . . . . . Deems Taylor
b. An Old Song Resung . . . . . Charles Griffes

IX. *Glee Club*

Coronation Scene from *Boris Godunoff*
(Russian 19th Century) . . . . . Moussorgsky

Princeton's progress from the light to the serious, or worthy, was also a slow evolution, guided by a man with tact and patience. Dr. Alexander Russell was appointed to the Henry Clay Frick Chair of Music in 1917 and given the additional title of director of music at the university. Among his duties was the direction of the college choir. He made no attempt to control the glee club but suggested an organization to be known as the Princeton Choristers. This was duly formed and for a time its existence paralleled that of the glee club, which continued its accustomed type of programs. Success came slowly to the Choristers but its membership gradually increased and eventually the officers of the glee club asked that their organization be merged with that of the Choristers. For several years the combined groups were known as the Princeton Choristers Glee Club but later the word "Choristers" was dropped, though the standards it implied have been rigidly maintained.

The records of the Intercollegiate Musical Council show something of the extent of this movement for better glee clubs. Altogether the membership numbers 118 clubs. The idea of an association originated in 1914 when Albert Francis Pickernell, a former member of the Harvard Glee Club, started the formation of an intercollegiate organization for annual contests. Last year fifteen regional groups from the Atlantic to the Pacific held sectional contests from which the winners were sent to the national tournament. Before 1932 the national contests were held in New York, but last April it was decided to hold the finals at a more central point, St. Louis. In 1933 the competition will be discontinued for a year, and in its place the college clubs will meet with foreign student choral groups for an international festival at the Chicago World's Fair.

These intercollegiate contests have introduced a new rivalry and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have done much to raise singing standards throughout the country. They have, moreover, aroused a truly genuine interest among the larger student bodies. The day may not have arrived when singers paint their college letters on their shirt fronts, as athletes sew them on their sweaters, but the contests are by no means in the debating team class. Even if they are not yet the subject of "pep" meetings, and few singers rush from their dressing rooms gasping "Let me sing and die for dear old Rutgers," they are nevertheless taken seriously.

The contests often hold as many surprises as football games or shell races. Last year the glee club from Pomona College, California, came to St. Louis and wrested first place from the defender of the national championship, New York University; from Yale, winner of the 1932 Metropolitan contest; and from the major universities of the Mid-West and East who had been victorious in their sectional meetings. No one begrudged Pomona its victory, especially when it was learned that its trip was financed in part by a contribution from the University of Redlands, a defeated rival in the Pacific Coast meeting.

Generally the contests have been marked by a high quality of sportsmanship although an occasional imitation of athletic procedure has resulted in the severance of intercollegiate relations. The most serious ruffling of the waters of harmony was caused by the withdrawal of Harvard, several years ago. The break was probably inevitable, for not many colleges have cared to maintain the rigid classicism of the Cambridge group. The overt act that caused the rupture was the choice of Horatio Parker's *Lamp of the West* as the prize song that all must learn. This song may not be Horatio Parker at his best, but it was chosen by a majority of the council members. It was not, however, the type of music Harvard cared to perform and therefore, basing their protest on the charge that the song was not selected by unanimous vote, the directors of the Harvard Glee Club announced that their group would no longer take part in the contests.

The facts reviewed seem to offer sufficient proof that better singing and the choice of worthier music is a voluntary act on the part of the students. The movement has been guided, not driven. It has shown that young ears and minds need only to be exposed to the best in music and art, for they have an innate taste that will make them choose the good and the beautiful. The undergraduate may be a follower of tradition but he likes to make tradition too.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other results of the movement are interesting and important. Preparatory schools have caught the spirit and have their own association for inter-school contests. For college graduates who must continue to sing, we find a renaissance of adult glee clubs, for which the Associated Glee Clubs of America arranges an annual festival in New York, generally in Madison Square Garden.

The singing of college glee clubs is without doubt as spontaneous as it ever was and represents as natural an expression. Obviously, any activity that is formalized and demands an approach to technical perfection becomes more stereotyped emotionally than that which requires less intellectual effort for its projection or performance. Nevertheless, the singing is hearty as well as delicate, and those who participate are surely finding an emotional as well as an intellectual outlet.

This brings us to a final charge against the new glee clubs. Commentators have frequently observed that since the glee clubs have turned highbrow there is less informal singing on the campus, in fraternity houses, and, I fear, even in the shower bath. This is altogether a pity, for song is a form of expression that should be indulged primarily for the benefit of the singer. When I was in college we used to sing during meals, at house party time the fraternities without house parties serenaded those that were having them, and we often made Saturday nights hideous when we finally came home. It may be that Prohibition is to blame for it's not easy to sing in a drug store, nor may one carol as readily in an automobile traveling at sixty or seventy miles an hour as he could in a buggy at seven or eight. Yet I think that the cause is more fundamental than Mr. Volstead, or improvements in transportation.

The college undergraduate has less time on his hands than he enjoyed twenty years ago and more to do with the little he has. He is, also, more of an individualist than his predecessors, a trifle more self-conscious, especially in regard to his sophistication. Having become a man, he has put away the childish things his elders enjoyed in a less complicated age. It is this attitude the alumnus fails to understand, or if he does understand it he has little sympathy with the youngster's desire to be himself. The college student of yesterday was a standardized product who now laments a change in specifications. Many are like parents who consider their own partaking of fish cakes and corn

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bread for breakfast sufficient reason for their children's doing likewise.

I doubt that the glee clubs are responsible for the decline of campus singing. It is caused rather by a change in attitude. The undergraduate of today expresses himself through a different medium, less direct, perhaps, but more in keeping with his changed surroundings. The younger generation is entitled to a revolt as well as its elders, and if the product of such an upheaval is an improvement in cultural standards the alumnus has little to complain of. The glee clubs and symphony orchestras—representing a free choice of the students—offer striking evidence of undergraduate discrimination. To hold that they indicate a lack of virility is to express a pitiably superficial view. The tradition that good music belongs only to the women is so out of date that the man who makes such a statement is likely to betray his age.

For myself, I live in constant fear that sometime, when I return to the campus, I may begin a sentence with "In the good old days," or "When I was in college," especially if the conversation turns to campus singing. Maybe I will be safe if I remember two things—first, that the alumni used to come back to college and boast that they had to carry water from the pump, and second, that even if the total disappearance of campus singing is the price to be paid for the new glee clubs, they are worth that, and more.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sanctions and the World Community

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL
Research Director, Foreign Policy Association

REDUCED to its simplest terms the question whether one supports the principle of international sanctions depends fundamentally upon whether one thinks it is possible to organize any kind of political society resting only upon good will. The early Christian fathers believed that in the state of nature men had lived without external coercive law—an idea which frequently appeared in the writings of later philosophers. But all of these thinkers realized that in the present dispensation reason alone was an inadequate principle of cohesion. Today, except for the philosophical anarchists and a few religious sects, every school of ethical and political thought seems to agree that within the state the element of coercion must be present. No state—and no successful federation of states—has maintained its existence without making some provision for police.

Despite the conclusion of the League Covenant and the anti-war pact, and despite the establishment of the World Court, force today plays a prominent part in relations among states. Each great power maintains an army and navy for the prosecution of national objectives. Although within a state, force is subordinate to law, in international relations each state has employed force at its own discretion, largely uncontrolled by international law. In fact, in the present stage of world politics, the measure of the influence of a state is usually its military strength. Among many circles the hope was expressed that with the conclusion of the Anti-War Pact in 1928 the use of force as an instrument of national policy would come to an end. Nevertheless at the time of concluding this pact, each great power carefully reserved the right to use force in "self-defense." Many of them defined this term to include not only resistance to actual in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vasion, but the protection of any national interest upon the high seas or in foreign lands. Until this interpretation is removed the use of force will be little affected by the Anti-War Pact.

Today some governments are advancing the view that the use of force is absolutely necessary to safeguard vital economic interests. During its recent dispute with China, Japan frankly declared it was only by force that it could meet the desperate needs of the Japanese people. Japan depended upon its trade with Manchuria, and this trade was being interrupted by the inability of the Chinese government to maintain order. To Japan the protection of its "life-line" in Manchuria was fully as important as preventing a hostile force from invading Tokyo. The League of Nations had not provided a pacific remedy for Japan's economic difficulties. Was not Japan justified therefore in resorting to force? Such is the first view of force—namely, that it is essential for the protection of the "vital interests" of the state.

A second opposite view is being advanced today by a group of intellectuals such as Professor Einstein of Germany and Lord Ponsonby of England who have organized a War Resisters' International, the members of which have placed "complete trust in an appeal to reason and the sense of justice in mankind rather than in military power." As one step toward resisting war they refuse to perform the compulsory military service required in most countries of the world. This movement hopes to enlist such a large number of pacifists pledged to refuse to fight that the hands of any government wishing to go to war will be tied. This group thus looks upon the abolition of war largely as an ethical problem.

Which of these two views is correct—the view which believes that force is an essential instrument of national policy, or the view which holds that war is morally wrong? It is difficult to believe that either of these views can serve as the basis for an organized society. It is theoretically possible to justify the resort to force for the solution of economic difficulties; but when this force is resisted by the state against which it is employed, the result will be widespread hostilities mutually destructive to both countries. The Lytton report conclusively demonstrates that in attempting to control Manchuria in defiance of its inhabitants and of China as a whole, Japan is really injuring its own economic and political interests. It is significant that since

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan first embarked upon its military adventure in September 1931 its financial condition has steadily deteriorated. Any nation, moreover, which even subconsciously believes that it may resort to force as a solution of its problems, lives in a morbid and unrealistic psychology which prevents it from employing more rational remedies. In September 1931 the economic situation in Japan was precarious, but not any more so than in many other countries which did not go to war as a solution of their difficulties. Dominated by a psychology of force, the Japanese leaders exaggerated the seriousness of Japan's internal situation and the possibility of effectively solving it by military means. The world today has developed such a complicated structure that the attempt of a great power to solve its economic difficulties by military force invites injury upon itself as well as upon the victim of its aggression, and, indeed, upon the world as a whole.

This argument against unilateral force as an instrument of national policy does not mean, however, that the doctrine of passive resistance and of non-cooperation is any more sound. I have the greatest respect for the pacifist who prefers imprisonment to conscription. But the complicated problems confronting international relations cannot be solved by the negative, anti-intellectual attitude of the conscientious objector. Almost certainly, when a crisis arises the handful of men having the character to resist the call to arms will be overwhelmed by the nationalistic passions which can always be aroused—if no other restrictions upon the temptation to resort to war have been erected. About 1850 Elihu Burritt in England organized a League of Universal Brotherhood pledging its members not to engage in any war. This movement was more powerful than the War Resisters' movement today. It had no effect, nevertheless, upon the belligerent course of either the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Whenever men in the past have taken the doctrine of non-cooperation seriously, they have inevitably been obliged to withdraw from the world—many of them going into monasteries. It is impossible to build any society upon passive resistance. The world needs a passion for peace, but this passion must be joined with intelligence and knowledge if those world institutions which will make peace really possible are to be constructed.

Many people who admit the necessity for a world institution deny that it should rest upon any other basis than "good will." They argue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the use of collective force is as unsound as of unilateral force—both will prove ineffective and self-destructive. Their argument overlooks the fact that the collective force of many powers will decisively accomplish an end which the force of a single state cannot hope to achieve. What is more important, a policy of unilateral force is not subordinated to international law or arbitration but only to the national will, in contrast to a system of collective sanctions which is necessarily subordinated to a procedure for the pacific settlement of disputes. The policy of unilateral force means international anarchy; the policy of collective force, subordinated to international law, means world order. From the practical standpoint the actual employment of force under the collective system will inevitably be less than under the unilateral system, for the collective system will induce a state to resort to pacific means for the settlement of a dispute, partly from fear of the imposition of sanctions. The great advantage, therefore, of a sanctions system is that it will *prevent* states from going to war. In contrast, a state at liberty to resort to unilateral force will be tempted to do so rather than submit a dispute to arbitration, if it believes that it is stronger than the other party to the dispute and if it fears that its cause would not triumph in a court of law. "Public opinion" is of course fundamental to any international organization. The existence of a system of sanctions will make it possible, however, for public opinion to concentrate upon a single objective and thereby become effective; whereas in the absence of such a system it is likely to be aimless and diffusive. The Japanese military leaders did not fear "world opinion" so long as world opinion did not urge material pressure against Japan. It was only when world opinion began to agitate for an economic boycott that these leaders became aroused.

One or two examples will demonstrate the preventive value of sanctions. During the past year two small Latin American states—Bolivia and Paraguay—have engaged in a virtual war over the Chaco district. In Washington a committee of neutrals has vainly attempted to maintain peace by "moral pressure." Had the leading American governments, early in the dispute, announced their intention of imposing an economic embargo upon that disputant who refused to submit to arbitration, I am certain that peace would have been immediately restored. No government was willing to take the lead in pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posing an embargo. Instead, the committee of neutrals continued to intone "moral admonitions," the chief result of which has been to diminish confidence in and the prestige of Pan-Americanism.

Another example will be found in the Sino-Japanese dispute. Admittedly this controversy presented greater difficulties to the existing peace machinery of the world than did the Bolivia-Paraguay dispute. Nevertheless a study of every phase of this controversy leads to the conclusion that had the United States, Great Britain, France, and other powers announced in September or October 1931 that they would withdraw their ambassadors from Tokyo and if necessary impose an economic embargo upon certain exports to Japan unless the latter accepted outside mediation in its dispute with China, the Japanese military party would not have succeeded in establishing the puppet state of Manchoukuo. The only argument that appeals to a military clique is force. Had the League members and the United States announced their intention of supporting international covenants by non-violent methods of coercion, the Japanese military party would inevitably have been checked and the liberal forces in Japan strengthened.

A curious inconsistency lies in the fact that in the recent Sino-Japanese dispute those governments which declined to consider the imposition of international sanctions in support of world peace machinery all maintain large armies and navies for the support of nationalistic objectives. Ostensibly armies and navies today exist for the sole purpose of self-defense. This principle may be accepted, provided international restrictions preventing its abuse are also accepted. Nevertheless if it is logical for a state to rely upon the principle of national sanctions and of self-defense, *a fortiori* it is logical for it to rely upon the principle of international sanctions and cooperative defense. So long as each state must rely only upon its own armaments it cannot afford to disarm, and all but the strongest states will live haunted by a sense of insecurity. On the other hand, if a world organization works out an effective system of collective sanctions, security will be obtained for states great and small, and disarmament will become possible. It is not important here to consider what would constitute the best type of sanction—whether Article 16 of the Covenant providing for a complete severance of economic relations with the aggressor is too sweeping, or whether an international police force,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supported by the French Government, should be created. It is essential to realize that no world organization can become of real influence in international relations until it supports an effective procedure for pacific settlement, by a system of sanctions. If one state is allowed to violate with impunity its obligations not to go to war, other states will feel tempted to do the same thing; and the treaties imposing these obligations—whether the Covenant or the Anti-War Pact—will inevitably become dead letters.

Although the opponents of international sanctions fail to produce any satisfactory plan for the development of world peace purely by "good will" they nevertheless bring several negative objections against sanctions. They contend that no government can be expected to make the material sacrifice involved in the imposition of sanctions, merely to prevent war over a dispute in which it has no immediate material interest. They believe that no government would actually keep its promise to impose sanctions in a given emergency, and that consequently the world can have no confidence that a system of sanctions will actually "work." This question whether governments will make a sacrifice on behalf of world organization goes much beyond the question of sanctions. It is true that because of the existence of an unreasoning, ingrowing nationalism, no government during the past few years has been willing to consider the application of sanctions. But it is equally true that for the same reasons no government has been willing to lower its tariffs or its armaments or to take any other step in favor of international peace. What the opponents of sanctions are really stating is that no system of world organization, involving any important restrictions upon national sovereignty, can be established. In taking this pessimistic position the opponents of international sanctions join hands with the nationalists and militarists. In doing so, however, they shift the argument from the practicability of sanctions to the possibility of world organization. Naturally no one who has a historical sense and who believes in the ultimate unity of mankind can admit that the establishment of a world community is impossible. Although there are enormous obstacles to be removed, such a community will gradually be constructed if public opinion in the leading countries earnestly and intelligently desires to destroy the institution of war. Such a desire must realize that however great the differences may be between a national and world community, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both cases the community must keep in reserve an ultimate power of coercion.

Nevertheless it is repeatedly urged that the application of collective sanctions against an aggressor state will result in "war." Those who invoke this argument do not seem to realize that because the war system has not yet been abolished wars may break out at almost any center in the world today. Far from leading to war, the development of an international sanctions system is the only means by which the policy of unilateral force can be eradicated. If a clash should conceivably occur between an aggressor state and the remainder of the world community, it would quickly be terminated because of the overwhelming strength of the world community.

Such a clash, moreover, could not properly be called "war." There is as much difference between war and international sanctions as there is between armed gangs and policemen in the city of New York. Both racketeering and private war must be destroyed; but neither can be destroyed without an effective system of coercion.

We should not delude ourselves that we can establish a world order by uttering fine words which, as at present, merely obscure an unwillingness to make any sacrifice for peace. The world today is confronted with a choice, not between "reason" and "force" but between war as an instrument of national policy, and sanctions as an instrument of international law. Fundamentally the choice is between world anarchy and world order.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Squandering Our Public Land

EARLE D. ROSS

Department of History, Iowa State College

THE investigations and recommendations of the special commission on the public domain, 1929–1931, along with pending land legislation, state and federal, mark but the latest attempt to make definitive adjustment of the most basic and persistent problem in our national development. At no place in American history, as Jameson remarks, do we get far from this primary relationship; the motto, "under all the land," has been true in the social and political no less than in the material realm. Land was the chief incentive for Colonial migration and the main interest in Colonial economy. Andrews sweeps away a mass of traditional fallacy in the precise statement that "Where hundreds sought for freedom of worship and release from political oppression, thousands saw in the great unoccupied lands of the New World a chance to make a living and to escape from their landlords at home." Land policies were the central feature of Colonial administration and a major cause of the Revolution. In the critical years following independence the creation of a public domain by the transfer of the trans-Allegheny region to common ownership was the most effective bond of unity. From that time to the passing of the frontier, questions involving directly, or growing out of the public lands, in their varied and far-reaching relationships, led all others in national attention and, in proposals and protests, took a large part of that of state governments. Benton estimated that during his eventful thirty years land discussions consumed a full quarter of Congressional time. With understandable hyperbole Clay could assert in 1832:

> Long after we shall cease to be agitated by the tariff, ages after our manufactures shall have acquired a stability and perfection which will enable them successfully to cope with the manufactures of any other country, the public lands will remain a subject of deep and enduring interest. . . . We may safely . . . anticipate that long, if not centuries, after the present day, the representatives of our children's children may be deliberating in the halls of Congress, on laws relating to the public lands.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This central issue was related more or less directly to all the other leading ante-bellum questions—the tariff, internal improvements, education, banking, surplus revenue, Indian relations, state relations of many sorts, and the fateful controversy over the extension of slavery. Every leader was forced to take his stand on the basic issue which in not a few cases helped to make or break careers. In more recent years the main problems have concerned the settlement of railroad grants, reclamation, and grazing, timber, mineral, and oil exploitations on a scale commensurate with the age of mass production.

For the whole trans-Allegheny West, land disposal has been—and for certain limited areas remains—*the* issue to which all others were subordinate. The commissionership of the general land office has been looked upon in the sections concerned as an appointment of first-rate importance to be filled only by the most influential leaders; ex-senators, ex-governors, and others of equal political standing have held or sought the post. One of the greatest disappointments in Lincoln's career was his unsuccessful candidacy for a position that brought so great local prestige.

With the alienation of the great bulk of the nation's landed possessions, symbolized by the shrinkage of annual reports from 900 page tomes to scant pamphlets, interest and attention naturally have diminished in this phase of federal activity. But that there remain issues vital not only to restricted areas but to the nation as a whole, the recent report and the reactions to it clearly demonstrate. An appraisal of past policies should be of service in judging the present proposals as well as others involving similar trends in federal activity.

Such a critical review is needed especially to give a proper perspective of the "good old days." The frontier period is often, if not generally, looked upon as our halcyon days, and the public lands are blessings that have shone with an unusual brightness as they have taken their flight. It is true that annual reports from the days of Gallatin and the findings of special commissions have indicated, from time to time, much amiss in the outposts; while contemporary agitators like Greeley and Julian, historians like Hart and Treat, sociologists like Hill, and economists like Sato, Magnusson, Teele, and Hibbard have all called attention to serious maladjustments and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

malefactions. But the general conclusion, especially of those who hold to the frontier interpretation in the extreme, is that the total effect of the domain's disposal has been "somehow good"; and for many the chief regret is that there is not more of it to go the same way.

The statistics alone are eloquent; the stupendous areas involved and the great causes to which they have contributed are in every way impressive. A cool billion and a half of acres, some three-fourths of our continental land area, have been disposed of down to a narrow arid or rocky segment. Of this imperial patrimony some half-billion acres have gone for intended happy homes, 100,000,000 directly and much more indirectly to education, 140,000,000 for transportation, and vast stretches for national reservations of various sorts. It may seem well-nigh presumptuous to examine too closely the teeth of so lavish a gift horse.

That, in times past, the nation's noble heritage has offered great opportunity and contributed directly to material well-being is a matter of record. The ever-increasing immigrant tide that joined the stream of national life, the steady westward movement of the center of population, the high standard of living of the average worker were all to be traced primarily to natural resources, the lion's share of which was at some time or other at the disposal of the federal government. From the earliest settlements to the close of the frontier, cheap or free land provided the differential advantage of the New World over the Old, as it did that peculiar opportunity which Emerson held to be synonymous with America.

Recognizing all this, as we must, a survey of our land policies from the initial deals with the Ohio colonizing companies to the latest adjustments of grazing and oil leases necessitates the conclusion that the social benefits of the domain, great as they were potentially, have been seriously restricted, curtailed, and counteracted by the actual workings of the disposal systems.

Instead of promoting security, stability, and settled habits, the administration of the domain allowed and directly stimulated speculation in some of the most demoralizing forms. As a matter of fact, in the early years of the nation land afforded the chief opportunity for buying on a margin and taking a flyer; there was never an adequate safeguard of the home-maker and conservative investor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the promoter and plunger. To the practice of unrestricted public-land disposal is to be traced in considerable part that speculative basis of our farm land values that has contributed so largely to the instability of the occupation.

Socially the over-stimulation of the westward movement and the migratory habits engendered was a disrupting influence in community building; such extreme mobility of the rural population tended to prevent the growth of estates upon which families lived through successive generations and maintained an interest in community welfare. The material betterment from such migrations was in many instances open to doubt. For the landless and unestablished, who had the requisite qualities for meeting frontier hardships, the wild lands offered a life career, but for those already settled there were often more real advantages, economic as well as social, in what they were led to abandon for the new and untried adventure.

The ease of original acquisition caused an exaltation of proprietorship as such and a corresponding stigma upon hired status throughout the "free west." This proprietary zeal persisted even into the last frontier, where all the pride of ownership was impotent to transmute the sands into gold. The assumption of those who encouraged settlement in such obvious sub-marginal areas was evidently that ownership was worthy of ambition though one owned in hell, and if the alternative was far removed from service in heaven it at any rate usually involved more of security. The opportunity to mount the business ladder, shaky though it might be, prevented the development of effective class-conscious labor organization until the seventies. Meanwhile much time and effort were wasted in unsound utopian ventures and the direct class conflict, unnaturally postponed, was all the more bitter when it arrived.

As in the case of security holders since the World War, the number of land speculators was greatly extended; to some degree every purchaser of government land was brought under the prevailing influence. The Hoosier woman who exhorted her easy-going spouse, in purchasing "Congress land" at a dollar and a quarter, to "git a plenty while you're a gittin' fer 'twont never be no cheaper" and had the satisfaction of seeing her investment increase a hundred fold—at least in paper values—exemplified, in her sphere, the vision and zeal of an Astor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There has been an over-emphasis upon frontier financial proposals as manifestations of social pathology and not enough upon the unsound productive systems of which the proposals were the natural outgrowth. Every panic from 1791 to 1893 was directly connected with land speculation. Those of 1819, 1837, and 1857, most notably, came as the culmination of periods of over-promotion of land sales and the attendant over-development of transportation and credit. That of 1873 was precipitated by railroad extension, induced by ill-considered and unduly lavish land grants, and the nineties' rival of the present depression was occasioned by the cheap money reactions of desperate frontiersmen. More recently reclamation has contributed its bit to the agricultural surplus; and there is a curious inconsistency—of genius perhaps—in the position of certain statesmen who with one hand have offered proposals for surplus disposal and with the other projects for adding to it by extending the productive land area.

It follows that the system has involved widespread waste, alienations that have resulted in no adequate or justifiable return in national well-being. Nothing was easier than for congressmen and state legislators to be prodigal with a resource that seemed unlimited, that required no money appropriation, that was available for widely separated regions, and thus was ideal for log-rolling combinations. Internal improvements have covered a multitude of unnecessary and impracticable undertakings. In cases of projects desirable in themselves many of the grants have been needless subsidies rather than essential aids and subventions. The trans-continental grant was urged as an emergency, Union-uniting enterprise, but it could hardly be argued seriously that three separate sets of bonds, with intervening links, were required for such security. Educational grants could undoubtedly show the best case, but these gifts were so loosely regulated, in the great majority of cases, that the returns were pitifully meagre compared with the princely endowments of schools and colleges which they might have afforded. More careful and far-sighted provision for safeguarding these investments in realty would have enabled the cause of education to share through the years the social increment of gain and thus have gone far to meet present problems of rising costs and equalization of burdens.

Large areas were granted to promote forestation and reclamation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under conditions where it was certain that such aims could or would not be secured. Lands, enticingly labeled, were offered to the individual home-seeker in regions that made other than capitalistic development physically impossible. In all of these cases the land passed definitely and finally from national possession—that was the most that could be said for the achievement of the policies.

Even more reprehensible and demoralizing have been the evidences of fraud and corruption that have attended the dispersion of the original domain to its present restricted bounds and somewhat uncertain status. All of our national policies of land disposal have been traced to Colonial practices; and at this same source may be found abundant precedents for the abuses and perversions of these policies. Head right manipulators, baronial engrossers, Indian despoilers, and back country squatters were the forerunners of the exploiters and looters of the public domain. The initial settlement of the Old Northwest, as well as the enactment of its great Ordinance, was attended by the operations of the Scioto "wrecking crew" whose agent, Joel Barlow, made use of literary propaganda as fraudulent as that which sent a more recent poet to the federal penitentiary. Evasion of crown and proprietary settlement regulations was carried over to the national sphere, and whenever the prevailing system was not to the liking of the frontier community the leaders adjusted it to their desires and convenience, peacefully, if possible; forcibly, if necessary. Historians like William E. Dodd and James Truslow Adams, in seeking the historical background of present day lawlessness, give much emphasis to the traditional practices of land law violators, whether individual or corporate.

States, acting through their accredited agents, have been *particeps criminis* in the plundering of the nation. When one recalls such episodes in state land disposal as the Yazoo affair, careless or faithless guardianship of the national bequests is not to be wondered at. Jefferson wrote with prophetic understanding in 1785 in protest against assigning the common lands to state control, that "they will either fool them away, or make a job of it to serve individuals."

Most notorious of such experiments were probably the so-called swamp land grants, made under the guise of reclamation but accurately and vividly characterized by Greeley as a "reckless and fraudulent transfer to certain states of millions on millions of choice

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public lands, whole sections of which had not muck enough on their surface to accommodate a single fair-sized frog; while the appropriation of the proceeds to drainage proved a farce and a sham. The lands went—all of them that had standing water enough on a square mile of their surface to float a duck in March with a good deal more beside, while never a shake of ague has any pioneer been spared by reason of all the drainage done under this specious act."

But with all due recognition of the talent and ingenuity of early manipulators, it must be conceded that the most spectacular operations came only with the wholesale transfers to cattle, timber, mineral, and oil companies.

The explanation of this failure of the great national resource to redound more fully to permanent national advantage, to correspond more nearly in practice to the theory under which the alienations were made, must be sought in the underlying conditions of our national evolution, in the limitations as well as the benefits of the frontier process. The very extent of resources created inevitably an exploitive attitude and ideal, an emphasis upon production as desirable for its own sake. Nature like the individual was functioning normally and justifiably only when at work in producing something of tangible utility. Old Man River might be content just to roll along, but to the frontiersman he was an available, more or less docile, beast of burden. Resources of all sorts, far from being their own excuse for being, must have a direct and immediate utilization. Dean Davenport, as reported by Russell Smith, has given this epitome of frontier attitude and purpose: "Here's a fine animal, let's kill it. Here's a big tree, let's cut it down. Here's a thick sod, let's plow it up." In such a society unappropriated public land was an anomaly; idle land was as undesirable as idle men; the nation should therefore be expropriated, the quicker the better, and the land put to work. The West, said the section's spokesmen in '62, didn't need scientific agriculturists but more dirt farmers to cultivate the land and populate the section. Idle stretches did nothing to swell the grain and livestock output, to bring business to land agents and county-seat merchants—or even to pay taxes.

Fully consonant with this exploitive aim was the prevailing and dominating individualism. Pure, unalloyed Adam Smithism never had a fuller application than in this country down to the close of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the free land era. Protective tariffs involved the only mercantilist survivals and social politics were not fully entered upon, in spite of the much-vaunted free-soil program. Everywhere individual self-interest—supposedly enlightened—was put before the social, the immediate consequently before the permanent. "Git a plenty while you're a gittin' " and let the future look out for itself. In fact down to the nester's repulsed assault of the arid belt, land development possibilities seemed as unlimited as those of the stock market three years since. Land, said the agrarian, was a natural right. Land, said the demagogic vote-seeker, was a free good like air and water. Benton's boyhood reading of *Exodus* implanted the conviction that the land belonged to the people. Jim Lane knew, by special revelation or otherwise, that "God never designed or intended that this Government should receive one single cent for her public land. I believe that God has made her guardian, and that she is to hold that land and part with it for no other purpose than for homes for her citizens; that the bartering or dealing in public lands . . . is cruel and sinful." The free American electorate had within itself the power to fulfil this divine purpose, so why be the hireling of another when you could "vote yourself a homestead"?

There has been geographical individualism as well. Sectional desires have hitherto prevented the attainment of a truly national policy. On no other issue, in fact, has the line between the older and newer regions been so sharply drawn. Landed states have always felt, not only that they have vested interests in the portions of the domain within their borders, but that such lands are by right their lands; and any attempted dissemination or effective regulation of the proceeds has been consistently and bitterly opposed. To the newest states the agricultural college grants appeared nothing short of an Eastern conspiracy to plunder the youthful communities of their only available asset, and at present the remaining public land states are unalterably opposed to the commission's proposal to cede to them surface ownership without mineral and oil content. The veteran Governor Hunt, of Arizona, in his annual message in 1931 asserted that a complete grant of all resources was "in harmony with the constitutional guarantee that all States shall enter the Union on an equal basis which has been recognized by the passage to private ownership of the lands of the older States of the Union."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fairness it should be recognized that the older states have been no less zealous in seeking to direct the disposals to their particular and selfish advantage. Turner, in commenting upon John Quincy Adams' lament at the failure of his plan to make the domain the source of a permanent support of national works, observes that "a system of administration was not what the West demanded; it wanted land." With equal truth it may be added that the East wanted it, too, for railroad promotion, industrial colleges, and general investment opportunities. Enthusiastic developers, West and East, saw in Uncle Sam's big estate the possibilities of both private gain and public advancement through the relative increasing of their section's enterprises—one of the rare instances in which the dictates of love and duty seemed to coincide. In this connection it may be suggested that the conflict of the free and slave interests, centering in the territories, might conceivably have been kept from its tragic dénouement by a more restricted and carefully regulated system of Western colonization.

The legislative reflection of these exploitive, individualistic, and sectional influences has been, instead of a systematic national land code, a series of acts inconsistent, conflicting, and piecemeal. The foundation ordinance, unworkable in spite of its basic principles, was followed by the disastrous credit system with numerous stay and relief acts; indirect but effective credit through preëmption, and a homestead law more and more denatured by reason of the inadaptability of a great portion of the area to which it was applied; the parallel operation of conflicting settlement and grant acts; and the traditions of tender treatment of the developers of the nation's resources. Conservation programs have had always to contend against the formidable combination of individual acquisitiveness and regional boosting. In short, opportunism rather than reasoned, impartial planning has dominated from beginning to date, with the exception of certain broad-visioned conservationist efforts—and even here the present commission, with all its avowed conservationist convictions and purpose, seems, in its specific recommendations, to mark a return to the old individualism.

In emphasizing these shortcomings in our past land disposal there is no necessary assumption that, given the distinctive conditions of our national growth, a markedly different course could have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed. It may well be, as James Truslow Adams concludes, that such a stabilized, previsioned scheme as Jefferson and John Quincy Adams sought, could have been forced "only by a despotic government . . . on a people multiplying with incredible rapidity and bursting with energy." But the lessons of the past are available, if we in our day have grown wiser, to apply to existing problems of the conservation of soil, forest, mineral, and oil resources, the regulation of the land supply, and the direction of its best utilization.

First and foremost in these days of planning we need a plan which is inclusive and adequate. We must plan for all of our land resources regardless of jurisdiction; the old competitive cross-purposed relations of federal and state lands must be replaced, for the remaining disposable areas, by a cooperative and coordinated adjustment. The creation of new "state domains" through tax confiscations and reforestation programs makes such unified activity all the more necessary. Basic in such a unified effort must be a thorough, scientific classification that will take account both of present emergencies and of long-time requirements. There is perhaps an opportunity to direct the back-to-the-country movement, which the depression is occasioning in certain regions, so that, contrary to past experiences, it may become something more than a hysterical spasm or a sentimental agitation. Such an effort might contribute definitely to a better and more permanent balance in national economy and society. All this and much more that could be specified leads inevitably to the conclusion that the future administration of our lands, both in national and state control, merits and demands—what we have never had and what the present tendency seems not calculated to provide—a high degree of courageous, enlightened social control.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Private Thoughts of a Pedagogue

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL
Warden, Saint Stephen's College

FOR the past twelve years I have been intimately connected with collegiate administration. For two-thirds of that time I was the president of a small college in the State of New York, seventy-two years old, recognized as of first rank by the Association of American Universities. At the end of that time my college became a constituent part of a well-known metropolitan university, was manned by teachers holding university rank, and began to enjoy the advantage of having the university degree conferred upon its graduated classes. Since then I have continued to preside over it, as dean. During the whole period I have had large opportunity of contact with American colleges and universities, with those who teach in them and those who administer them. For four of these years I was a member of the Executive Committee of the Association of American Colleges, and its Treasurer. I have attended no end of conventions, listened to scores of addresses, read every book on the subject on which I could lay my hands. I have talked, personally and intimately, with presidents, deans, and professors. I have been a guest in over fifty colleges, chiefly in the East, not as an official examiner but as an informal visitor. As a result of all this experience and observation, I feel that I really do know something about American college education, as it actually is and as it appears to those who are engaged in it.

An educational system, I take it, is a regimen designed to nourish the whole of man; that he may be fed, from the store of past learning in terms of present experience, to the maximum of whatever digestive capacity he has, and may be enabled thereby to offer to the gods, and to contribute to the community, an enriched personality. If this is an adequate definition, our present American educational system is extraordinarily ineffective. Despite large talk and the expenditure of vast sums of money, we are not getting much. There have been several people lately, like Abraham Flexner and Albert

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jay Nock and William Setchel Learned, who have been saying much the same thing, to the discomfort and even indignation of a majority, or at least a more vocal fraction, of the educational fraternity. It is possible, however, that these and other critics who have been loud in protest against our educational trend are not wholly fair to administrators and teachers. The defects may not be due to incompetence, and even less to dishonesty, among pedagogues; for perhaps we have about the kind of educational system which America desires. It may be the *mores* which are at fault.

I am not willing to go as far as the president of one of our women's colleges who said, in the course of an address, that the American people were essentially inferior, and consequently could not be expected to produce anything much in the way of culture; and who argued therefrom that schools and colleges should be content to produce, for the most part, mediocre men and women trained for practical jobs like selling bonds or washing the baby. There is some truth in his contention. Americans are not congenitally second-rate, but they often make serious mistakes in judgment. The faults in our educational system are indeed due to defective desire on the part of our people as a whole. They are reflections of mistakes which we commonly make in estimating man and his nature, in defining the good life.

There can be no doubt, for example, that our countrymen have long over-valued material comforts and conveniences as food for the human spirit, and under-estimated the joys of creative art, mystical perceptiveness, considerate good manners, and careful thinking. This resulted in an educational attempt to turn out people to do practical things, more than to have facility in pursuit of the imponderables. All teachers admit it. Alas, some boast of it. The most casual study of the curricula of American schools and colleges during the past twenty years will prove it beyond doubt.

Again, we Americans have long made the mistake of supposing that men are created equal—not merely in political rights, which is what Jefferson meant by the phrase, but in both degree and kind of ability. The result has been, naturally, an attempt to train all of our children alike. Our people have felt that the kind of schooling good for one must be good for all. We have, in consequence, quietly cut down educational expectations to meet the restricted ability of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many. Those who are intellectually competent have been untended and the mediocre majority, incapable of anything which approaches real thinking, have been honorably ejected from our schools with the absurd impression that they can and do think. The able have become vague, lazy, and discontented, while the many have acquired a most unfortunate conceit.

It is ridiculous to suppose that all men are by nature endowed with brains fit for real thinking. Neither scientific tests nor common experience validate this impression. Most men cannot think at all in anything but the most concrete terms, or in more than the simplest fashion. The schools have been compelled to recognize this in fact, even when they avoid such recognition in professed theory. They have been forced so to reform their curricula and change their methods as to do away with formative studies, which cannot be followed with success except by the intelligent few. That is the real explanation of much of the educational practice prevalent in the United States.

Very few educators really suppose, for example, that freedom for students to do as they please is better than discipline; but they do know from practical experience that most of the students, not having any brains to be disciplined, are happiest and create least trouble when free from its restraints. There are not many educators who believe, to take another example, that teaching courses in English literature is really a sound substitute for linguistic studies, or that "mathematics as related to life" is as good for the human mind as analytic geometry or calculus. Of course not. They merely know, from sad trial, that the great mass of the students dumped on them because of compulsory education laws or, in the case of colleges, by social pressure—the great crowd who must be secured and held to fill the buildings and to provide the teachers with jobs—is mostly composed of people with only brains enough to comprehend piffling subjects, and that with difficulty. They are forced by such pressures to hand out high school diplomas to students who cannot do a single intellectual task with competence, to send forth alleged Bachelors of Arts who do not even know what Arts are, and Bachelors of Science who have not so much as heard of scientific method.

We ought to be discovering and segregating the few who can think, and giving them the disciplines they need; while the many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are trained to do decently and with self-respect the less intellectual tasks which they are fitted to perform. Training, every child ought to have, if possible at public expense; but it may well be of a sort fitted to his or her abilities. Some are tool-minded and may become happiest and most fit in skilled trades. Good, let them have opportunity for it. Others have brains of a sort to be disciplined into scholarship. Let that be done. Still others have no minds to speak of. Let them be exempted from formal training. To put all three kinds of persons into one omnibus is to turn out morons who are bewildered, tradesmen who are not much good, and scholars who are a sort of joke. Nine out of ten of the educators whom I know admit this willingly, in private. In public, most of them dare say little about it. Very few are permitted to defy the popular dictum, as crazy as any enunciated by the Mad Hatter, that everyone's baby is as bright as everyone else's baby.

It would be hard to say which kind of pupil suffers most in an undifferentiated system like ours. To many of us it seems that the potentially brilliant ones fare the worst. Some scornfully ask if a publicly supported school-system ought to be run chiefly for the few boys and girls who are going to be scholars. My point is that our system at present is run at the expense of such students, and to their definite detriment. Surely a child with exceptional brains ought not to be regarded as a nuisance. That is what he often is, however, both in our lower schools and in our colleges. These brighter students are bored and rendered lazy by the slow pace that is set. It is notorious that boys and girls of eighteen in America are no further advanced intellectually than children of sixteen in most European countries. Two years of each bright young American's life are wasted, at least as far as scholarly achievement goes. Throwing away one-sixth of the time between the ages of six and eighteen cannot be good for anybody. Nor is it any more helpful, when school days are done, to loaf through college at a pace set by an inferior majority. There are few who will deny that any reasonably bright undergraduate who knows he must, and is freed from artificial brakes, can do in college the usual four years of work in three. Almost everyone I know admits, especially after dinner, that these delays are characteristic of our system.

Clever pupils suffer also from the inferiority of American teach-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers. It is not surprising that most of these are mediocre people. It is impossible to find enough fertile-minded, alert, imaginative men and women to conduct schools for everybody's children. The Lord does not make that many intelligent people. Consequently we must take middling-dull ones, for the most part. This is very sad. Intellectual power and facility come almost wholly by contact of mind with mind, direct and intimate. Jesus and the Twelve, Socrates in discussion with a few friends, Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and a student on the other; these are types of the only adequate schools. But the poverty of our teaching material has forced us to devise mechanisms the purpose of which is to protect pupils, as far as we can, from malpractitioners. At least in part our methodology accomplishes this; but at the cost of dullness. Even the competent teacher who occasionally gets into the profession is cramped by the methods, and prevented from setting younger minds aglow. We ought to admit and bewail, even while we attempt to excuse, this substitution of methodology for personality. We should admit the handicap placed by it upon the development of anything like sound scholarship. Instead we have rationalized our situation. We have so made a virtue of necessity that many, if not most, of our educational spokesmen have come to regard elaboration of method as a notable achievement, instead of as a compromise and a subterfuge. To an already dull and hesitant routine we have thus added an increasingly rigid and uninspiring pedagogy. We have turned over what was once the art of teaching to a crowd of skilled artisans, who know all the tricks, and rely on them. It may be that we had to do it, but we might at least stop boasting about it.

These, then, seem to be the three great mistakes of the American people which have contributed to the debasing of our education: first, a feeling that the business of schools is to facilitate the production and ownership and use of things as the one great good in life, a good so great that other goods may safely be pushed into the background or, in some cases, wholly forgotten; second, an illusion of equality which ignores natural differentiations in human mentality, which denies that men differ in kind and degree of ability; third, a conviction that teaching is a trade, like brick-laying or bookkeeping instead of a high art—that education is a mechanical process.

As a result of these errors and of the compulsions which they en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gender American education seems, to a good many of us, definitely defective in these respects:

1. That it is satisfied to train people who can do things, even if they be otherwise ignorant, crude, and vulgar;

2. That it encourages the incompetent and boorish to believe themselves adept and gentle;

3. That it tends to make able-minded people lazy, conceited, unhappy, and cynical;

4. That it has debased standards of scholarly achievement until the Ph.D. degree means little, the M.A. degree hardly enough to matter, the B.A. degree little more than the passing of time, and a high school diploma—the less said, the better;

5. That it has so ignored the practice and philosophy of religion as to have deprived most of our people of stability to endure the shock of circumstances, and has thus engendered in the citizenry at large a dangerous hysteria, sometimes approaching mania;

6. That it has substituted for teaching a Juggernaut apparatus, which flattens out personality, to the possible profit, but hardly the self-respect, of an hieratic caste;

7. That it has made American scholarship, despite a considerable number of brilliant scholars, to be regarded with disrespect by other nations; while at the same time it has engendered throughout the land an academic complacency both ridiculous and devastating;

8. That increasingly it obscures our vision of the great tradition, those ways of urbanity which might be our heritage, until we have largely lost the power to understand, control, or enjoy our civilization.

Aside from these few minor defects, American education is undoubtedly admirable.

What to do? Tell the truth about it, no matter how unwelcome the truth may be. Fight for something better and go down, if indeed one must go down, bloodied but serene. Realize that is is nothing less than the *mores* which must be resisted. It may be hard to sell sweet odors of Araby to a people whose sense of smell is deadened; but there is in doing it a compensating romance. Meanwhile, for those who cry that all is well in Zion, one may say one's prayers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Economists and the World Crisis

ELMER DAVIS

I AM not an economist—only a member of that humble but occasionally useful class, the popularizers. But by ancient privilege a cat may look at a king, and in virtue of that same large tolerance a layman may perhaps be permitted to scrutinize a group of savants, and offer some commentary on their behavior in the past few years; especially if the layman happens to be an average specimen of a very large group—the ordinary citizens whose knowledge of economics goes no farther than the obligatory college freshman course; who in times past never had any particular understanding of that science or any particular interest in it; who regarded such matters as the money question, and the theory of value, with the same respectful incomprehension that they felt about the doctrine of the Trinity; who supposed, until the autumn of 1929, that they had nothing to do with economics, and that economics had nothing to do with them.

The average citizen knows better now, but there remains between him and those who are supposed to know, a gap, not only in knowledge but in attitude, that needs to be bridged. In the complex society of the present and the future, a good understanding between the average man and the expert is of tremendous importance; and in no field is this more true than in economics. If we are ever to have a sanely ordered society—if our present society is to hold together—the economists must be among the most responsible advisers of our rulers. And in a democracy we must have not only leaders fit to lead, but followers who are convinced that the leaders are worth following.

It cannot be said that either of these conditions has been ideally fulfilled in the past four years. The administration which is soon to pass out of office did often enlist experts of various sorts to find facts; but it usually employed them only to find supplementary arguments, on the plane of reason, in support of doctrines already received by revelation, and not to be altered if it turned out that they were not in accord with the facts. The most conspicuous of many instances was of course the protest of 1028 economists against the Smoot-Hawley

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tariff bill. Granted that this was not a purely spontaneous demonstration, that somebody drummed up this protest, none the less it was a most remarkable occurrence; more than a thousand men whose professional reputation was their chief asset were willing to stand up and be counted, as experts, on a controversial political issue. Nothing that the economists have done in recent years has been so creditable—and this is true whether you happen to believe that they were right, in this instance, or not. That is the sort of thing that must happen, more and more frequently, if a complex society is to be conducted at all; the men who know must say what they know, even if they are aware that somebody will be offended.

A corollary, of course, is that the men who know must really know; and another corollary is that the men who govern must be willing to listen to expert advice, even if it happens to be unpalatable. In this particular case the mass protest of experts was worse than futile. The President signed the Smoot-Hawley Act; and while he did so, apparently, without any great enthusiasm, his admiration for that measure increased month by month, in direct ratio to the decline of customs receipts under the new rates; until by the time he was campaigning for reelection he seemed to regard this latest tariff as the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the brain of man.

Criticism of an administration already repudiated is shooting a dead duck. The point is worth mentioning only because Mr. Hoover is superior both in intellectual capacity and in range of information to the average of our recent presidents. He certainly qualifies as an intellectual in at least the ordinary sense of that term; and since his qualifications were not minimized by his publicity there is some real danger that his failure may discredit intelligence as such. He failed, not because he was too intelligent but because he was not intelligent enough; because, at critical moments, he was governed by metaphysical concepts whose truth he did not question, no matter how much the facts might contradict them.

I am no passionate admirer of the incoming president, but one thing about Mr. Roosevelt enlists my confidence—he does not seem to know what to think about the tariff—and I note that even experts are by no means of one opinion. We are more likely to be served well by a president who does not know what to think, and may possibly end by taking the best professional opinion, than by one who regards

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all controversial issues as closed by the infallible pronouncement of a party platform.

Whether or not the next administration is properly hospitable to expert opinion, the only chance of making modern society work at all lies in getting a government which will be guided by expert opinion. This will entail both a change of heart among men who are elected to public office, and a much livelier and more continuous interest in the whole matter on the part of the average citizen; and it will further entail—with all respect be it said—a higher degree of dispassionateness, of trustworthiness, among the experts, notably so among the economists.

Economics is, of course, a social science; or at least is so counted. Mr. George Soule has observed that it "is not yet a science" at all; and some of us indeed are pessimistic enough to feel that all the branches of learning which are politely called the social sciences might be better described by some other name. But whatever you call them they deal, as Professor Taussig has remarked, not with the precise quantities of the physical sciences (even these are by no means as precise as they used to be) but with "man and his wavering and incalculable behavior." Furthermore, they deal with matters of present urgency, affected in consequence by present emotions; not only the emotions of the average man who is at once the material of the science, and the heathen to be converted by the scientist's conclusions, but the emotions of the scientist himself. If the economists have made grave blunders it is not only because they deal with the wavering and incalculable behavior of man, but because they are themselves men, whose behavior is likely to be wavering and incalculable.

Astrophysics deals with matters of vital importance to the human race, and it appears to be the most inexact of sciences. In successive seasons we learn that space is curved, that it is not curved; that the earth is two billion years old, that it is ten billion years old; that the universe is finite and more or less stable; that the universe is expanding and contracting like an accordion. No wonder that minds which crave a sense of order and stability in life revolt against the levity of the astrophysicists, who are willing to tear up one universe after another and throw them into the waste basket, to begin again with confidence that this time they will come somewhat nearer the truth than they did last year or the year before.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Economists, as a class, are somewhat more flexible than theologians but considerably less so than astrophysicists. It cannot be said that they deal with graver matters. Nothing is more important to the human race than the question whether the second law of thermodynamics is or is not valid, whether the universe of which we are residents is or is not inexorably running down. But this problem is not of immediate urgency; and whether the answer is pleasant or unpleasant there is in all probability nothing we can do about it. The economist deals with present problems which can often be affected by human action; he reaches conclusions whose validity can often be tested, not a billion years from now, but next month or next week. This ought to make him at once more humble and more flexible than the astrophysicist, less dogmatic in pronouncing his opinions and readier to admit it when the evidence proves them wrong.

Economists are not the only men who have made mistakes; all we like sheep have gone astray, and if we laymen can say that at least our mistakes have harmed no one but ourselves, that is not particularly to our credit. But the experts are paying for their reputation. People who believed them when they were wrong are now in the mood to disbelieve them, even if they happen to be right.

It would be ungracious as well as unnecessary to recite the mistakes of eminent economists in the past four years; nor is there any need here to offer the case for the defense. That was done in *Harpers Magazine* for last August by Professor Taussig, who compared the situation of the economists in the face of the crisis to that of the doctors in dealing with cancer. They know a good deal about it, they are doing their best to learn more; but they do not know yet what causes the disease or what will cure it. It is perhaps appropriate here to point out some reasons why great men have gone astray and to suggest not only how these men may be a little more trustworthy in the future, but also how they may convince the average man of their trustworthiness.

This latter objective may seem ignoble to the more austere of the scientists. A year ago last June Sir Josiah Stamp remarked in an after-dinner speech to some of his colleagues that "it is not the duty of the economist to be an amateur politician, and regulate himself by the gullibility of the public. He must ascertain the truth and teach it, regardless of what the voter can stand or understand." In the modern

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic world, however, the destiny of nations—the course that organized society is to follow, with ineluctable consequences to all of us, great and small, expert and inexpert — is determined, not always, but now and then, on certain critical occasions, by the voters. It is hardly the part of wisdom, therefore, to disdain to make oneself, and one's expert opinions, intelligible to the masters of one's destiny. Despise the arts of the politician, but they are about the only practical means of getting things done. If a man will not use them to get done what he thinks necessary, somebody else will use them for the attainment of very different objectives.

The scientist is a bad scientist if he regulates himself by the gullibility of the public; but he is a bad citizen if he does not try to mitigate that gullibility—if he does not try to teach the public what he thinks is the truth, even though that entails a wearisome reiteration of the elementary; if he does not try to make the average man, whose vote may determine even the exceptional man's destiny, understand that certain things are likely to work, and certain other things almost certainly will not work. And now and then there is evidence that public intelligence in politics, low as it often is, may sometimes be rather higher than that of the politicians who think they are playing down to it. But before the pure scientist attempts to educate the public he ought to make sure there is no beam in his own eye. The layman may not always see that protruding timber beforehand; but he can see it afterward. The average citizen may not know a great deal about economics, but after reading the papers for the last four years he feels he knows a good deal about economists; and he inclines to believe, until convincing disproof is offered, that even experts are men of like passions with himself.

Probably no recent book on economics is more renowned than Mr. Keynes's *Economic Consequences of the Peace*. In the twelve years since its appearance many of its scientific theories—not all, but many —have come to seem sound to people who rejected them at the moment. They were, of course, rejected at the moment by such a large fraction of society because men are emotional more often than they are rational—not only men who read books, but men who write them. Mr. Keynes argued for a cancellation of war debts which would have meant, in connection with his reparations proposals, substantially that Great Britain should pay almost as large an indemnity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Germany, and that the United States should pay one considerably larger. The course of events has shown that on the whole this was good realistic reasoning. But such a suggestion, made immediately after the close of the War, was not only inequitable but unpalatable, and it is not surprising that it failed to gain much favor with American opinion. A further reason for its rejection is implicit in the book itself. Mr. Keynes's intense dislike for the French and the Poles—or at any rate for the personified national concepts of France and Poland—was not concealed; and his arguments against the French and Polish points of view lost some weight in consequence. The argument appeared to the reader, however it may have been intended by the author, as an antithesis between Keynes's emotions and other people's emotions.

When President Hoover addressed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on May 1, 1930, he told his hearers that "all slumps are the inexorable consequences of the destructive forces of booms," and went on to give an interpretation of the events of the past six months which I think any economic expert would approve as sound, on the basis of the evidence then available. Five months later, speaking to the convention of the American Bankers Association, he repeated that "whatever the remote causes may be, a large and immediate cause of most hard times is inflationary booms." Continuing, he observed that "the economic fatalist believes that these crises are inevitable, and are bound to be recurrent. The same thing was once said of typhoid, cholera, and smallpox. This is not the spirit of modern science. Science girds itself with painstaking research to find the nature and origin of the disease, and to devise methods for its prevention." This, again, is unexceptionable. Yet President Hoover in action (or rather in inaction) was then, and for almost a year afterward, not only devising no methods to prevent a recurrence of the disease, but was making no effort to cure its present onset; he was relying on time, luck, the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. And when he was a candidate for reelection he had revised his opinions as to the nature and origin of the disease. No longer did it have anything to do with inflationary booms as such. It all went back to causes whose inexorable operation was under way a dozen years before he took office; it was something for which he could not have been blamed.

Obviously even a politician in office can view the course of events

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a dispassionate scientific coolness, when no election is at hand; yet when compelled to get out and fight for his job he can bring himself—from the loftiest impulses of public service—to repudiate the good sense he has shown in the past. The good done by President Hoover in the past year was accomplished largely by the institution of a limited type of Socialism. It was limited in extent and was meant —how successfully no one can say—to be limited in duration; none the less it was Socialism, or at any rate Collectivism, as far as it went. In spite of this, the man who had introduced it, and probably averted still more serious disaster by so doing, was denouncing Socialism right up to the end and declaiming rhapsodies of praise about the old-fashioned individualism which in practise he had rejected.

Some allowance may be made—or at any rate commonly is made—for careless dealings with the truth on the part of candidates for office. But we expect something better from the universities. Usually, it should be said, we get it; but there have been some conspicuous instances, in very high places, of experts whose business it is to deal with the wavering and incalculable behavior of man, who yet were totally oblivious of the effect their doctrines were almost certain to have on the human mind.

In May 1927 one of the most distinguished of American economists, a man who has rendered high service both to the theory and to the practise of economics, published a book which began with the complaint that certain writers had been talking about the "bankruptcy of economics," on the ground that the economists had failed to make a scientific study of one of the outstanding phenomena of the new era of Coolidge prosperity. The book in question was an answer to that complaint, and offered the scientific study that had been demanded. The author described the century of diligent research and hard thinking that following the industrial revolution had gone into the rebuilding of the science of economics; and went on to say that as a consequence of the new developments the author had been considering, "we now stand on the brink of another revolution in economic science and economic life, scarcely inferior to its predecessor."

That was in 1927. We have since then experienced a revolution in economic life and a revolution, not to say a disintegration, in economic science; but not in either case—unfortunately—the one forecast in the passage quoted. For surely no book ever laid down more attractive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blueprints of a new and brighter economic era. The abolition of poverty had not yet been officially promised; but its whole economic and metaphysical framework was already present in this announcement of a millennium which still remains around the corner.

In times past it had been supposed that there was a regrettable but inescapable antithesis between spending and saving; one could either have a good time with money or invest it for future profit, but the same money could not be applied to both uses. But in 1927 we heard that "in the broader sense there is really little difference between production and consumption." Both are utilization of wealth. Production is not merely the growing of crops, the manufacture of things, but "the creation of the productive efficiency which renders future wealth more easy of attainment." In other words, in having a good time one does more than have a good time; one increases productive efficiency and thereby makes a due contribution to the welfare of society. So far as I know, this was the first time it had been announced by an economic authority of the very first rank that a man could eat his cake and have it too. The author drew a clear enough distinction between productive consumption, and consumption that is destructive or merely neutral; but the criterion of utility must be the result. The species of productive consumption primarily considered by the author was the driving of automobiles purchased on the instalment plan. For the book in question was Professor Seligman's *Economics of Instalment Selling*. If I use it as a text for some observations, it is with no lack of respect either for his great authority, or for the lofty idealism with which his work is informed.

At that time (as Mr. Coolidge was presently to note in his final message to Congress) the American standard of living had passed beyond necessities and into the realm of luxury. That luxuries had become such necessities that a man who had all he needed might still be considered poor, and might so consider himself, was not regarded in the excitement of the moment; any more than anyone conceived the possibility that in another four years the bare necessities of 1928 would have become luxuries which few could afford. In those days the American people were just about to enter the Promised Land. "It is no longer necessary," Professor Seligman wrote, "for the individual to skimp and save, to look with apprehension to the future, to endeavor at all costs to make provision for the days to come." Indeed,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a multitude of respected authorities were telling us in those days, the individual who did that was not only a fool but a bad citizen; it was his duty not only to spend all he made but to sign up for all he hoped to make the next year. Again, Professor Seligman made the requisite reservations; but in the popular version of his doctrine these were usually overlooked. There are, he observed, two kinds of poverty. We are poor in the old sense "if we have not enough money to satisfy our wants"; but in 1927 this familiar form of poverty was about to be abolished. In its place a new kind of poverty had been invented; as Professor Seligman put it, "we are also poor if we have not enough wants to induce us to live a civilized life." Every advertising page of the period shouted that same doctrine simplified, made cruder, but in its essentials the same doctrine proclaimed by the high authority of Seligman. The man who did not want an automobile or a radio, who thought he could get better value out of his money somewhere else, was a bad citizen. Skeptics, even then, suggested that if this year's commodities continued to be bought with next year's income, the increase of the nation's productive plant would outrun the consumer's capacity, and that some day, consequently, there would remain no unmortgaged income to buy with. But this, said Professor Seligman, was "entirely erroneous." Increased production increases income; and "the productive utilization of wealth" (that is, more golf, more radios, more automobiles) "makes men more efficient." The spiral was to move forever upward. "If the possibilities of output are boundless, the possibilities of consumption are still more so."

So far as the layman can discern, the facts set down in the book are correct, and the inferences drawn from them are, in most cases, at least, defensible. One direct attack, however, can be made on this doctrine—which was also the doctrine of most of America in 1927, 1928, and 1929; but this attack can hardly be made on economic grounds. "There are no limits to the growth of demand," wrote Professor Seligman, "save those which depend on the physical and economic restrictions on production." He evidently never envisaged the possibility that some members of the human race might grow tired of being mere consuming machines, of working harder and harder in order to have more and more money to spend for the things someone else had to sell. A man who had been for many years professor in a great university should at least have realized that some people

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might not regard consumption as the whole, or even the primary, duty of man. But this, after all, is aside from economics.

Since the chief effect, if not the chief purpose, of this doctrine was to stimulate the sale of automobiles, the statistics of automobile production since 1929 would indicate that something was wrong with it, from the purely economic standpoint. In the first place, a confusion between the possible and the necessary; what we should all (or most of us) have liked to have had happen, and what might conceivably have happened under certain circumstances, was set down as already happening. True, the author, in the spirit of the scrupulous scientist, set down his provisos, his qualifications, his reservations. There must be an adequate distribution of purchasing power (but, by implication, there was); productive consumption differs from wasteful and destructive consumption (but by implication American consumption is generally productive). An examination of the whole book, qualifications and reservations included, and some knowledge of what was going on in the world and the sort of people living in it might have led to the conclusion (even in 1927) that the thesis was attractive but not wholly plausible.

But most people did not read Professor Seligman undiluted and entire. His doctrine was announced at a dinner given by General Motors and most people learned the doctrine from the column or two which the newspapers published about that dinner, or they got it at still another remove from somebody who had heard about it. And here the doctrine was not accompanied by the qualifications which might have warned the cautious and reflective reader of the book. Was that the fault of the author? He might, since he has lived a good many years, have guessed how his doctrine would be taken by the average man and the average woman, always avid to believe that what is agreeable is true. Here was one of the most agreeable prospects ever set before the human race, and it was presented on the authority of one of the most distinguished living economists. I do not believe that any book was ever published in the United States which so strongly tended to corrupt the mentally and emotionally immature of all ages as *The Economics of Instalment Selling*.

It is a pleasure to turn from this flagrant instance of how a scientist should not behave—especially a scientist attached to a university, one who might be expected to feel a somewhat higher sense of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responsibility than the salaried economist of a bank, an investment trust, or a public-utility corporation—to the behavior of the general run of economists in the past two or three years. They cannot be accused of concealing what they know, or even what they surmise. If their views of the causes and the cure of economic crises, or their opinions of the possibility of cure, are by no means in accord, that is no more than was to be expected, and creates a greater confidence on the part of the general public. I can here note only one detail, applying to only one aspect of contemporary economics, though that is a fairly conspicuous one—the discussion of economic planning.

If America falls it will not be for lack of a plan but more probably because of a surplus of them. Plans have been offered by the dozen in the past two years, yet nothing has been done about them. The outgoing administration was opposed to the whole idea of a planned economy, though its policy of the past year, its only record of successful achievement, was an acceptance of the idea even if the planning was on a modest scale. What the incoming administration will do depends apparently upon which of Mr. Roosevelt's somewhat changeable moods may happen to dominate him at the moment of action.

Professor Taussig has remarked that "no one can say what is the best way of organizing for planning, and still less can one say what will be its results." No one knows—certainly not an amateur—which is the best of the many plans that have been suggested; but even an amateur can see that the idea of planning has not been sold to the class whose conversion is most important. The economists, the statisticians, the engineers may be for it by an overwhelming majority; but one would not get many votes for it, yet, among the owners of industry.

Those who believe in the class struggle may not care to waste time in trying to convert the owner class, for by dogma the owners will hang on stubbornly till the aroused workers in their overwhelming numbers dispossess them. I do not believe this is true; at least I do not believe there is any earthly necessity for things to work out in that way. What used to be called the profit system has for three years past been the deficit system; and even the blindest can see that if we let things go on in the old way, after the next period of greater or less prosperity the profit will be the deficit system again. A couple of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years ago the emotional attachment of the average industrial capitalist to the old system was so strong that he could not be reasoned with; but this has considerably weakened by now, and will be weaker still before anything that can be called prosperity comes back. A systematic attempt to persuade the owners of American industry that a planned economy would be, in the long run, a good thing for them as well as for their workers and consumers might at last have some chance of success.

If the orthodox Socialist theories are correct there is no need to bother with the owners; but a good many owners are also managers and if one considers American industry as a whole, it is very largely the owners who would have to run it under a planned economy—even, perhaps, under a Socialist economy. It is obviously to the general interest to have the plan operated (once it is adopted) by men convinced of its desirability and practicability, rather than by reluctant die-hards submitting, under protest, to an act of Congress; besides which, of course, the more people who are converted in advance, the more chance there will be that a change, once enacted in law, could be actually accomplished with a minimum of economic disturbance.

Economic planners have given most of their attention to the technical details of their plans, and very little to the selling of their ideas. It may seem irrational to criticize the planners for not being evangelistic enough, when I have criticized Professor Seligman for preaching an evangelist's sermon in the vestments of a scientist; and perhaps the answer is that I believe in planning and did not believe (even in 1927) in Professor Seligman's deferred-payment millennium. But aside from that I believe the thing can be done properly and decently, with due recognition and acknowledgment of arguments on the other side. Mr. Simeon Strunsky has lately been contending that scientists should never be allowed to rule because they must follow truth wherever it leads, without any consideration of the social utility of their conclusions. So they must; but if they happen to reach conclusions which they think will be socially useful, it ought to be possible to set forth those conclusions persuasively.

But the man who does that must be sure that his conscience is clean and his heart is humble. I have spoken of the salaried economists attached to corporations, and I do not question their integrity. But a man who works for a bank or a manufacturing company can no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more publicly assail the interest of his employer than a lawyer can attack the case of his client, or a clergyman can impugn the doctrines of his church. For the detachment and impartiality we need we must look to the universities—where many men have already displayed it, and others now chastened are likely to display it in future; and to the newspapers, whose financial editors have on the whole made a better showing than any other class of economists in the past four years. Less than any other group have they let their own hopes, their own pride, stand in the way of a disinterested effort to ascertain the truth.

We are likely to need expert knowledge and cool reasoning even more in the next administration than we did in the last one. Industrial planning may or may not become an urgent issue, but there remains the question of the tariff which we hope, at least, may at last be considered as a scientific problem rather than a religious dogma; there is the disturbing and perhaps insoluble problem of farm relief; and there is, and not only on the farm, the question of the practical possibility of deflation of indebtedness to meet the deflation of everything else. The candidate for whom I voted last November thought (and with the support of some expert opinion) that this could best be accomplished by a capital levy. There are grave practical objections to that, but still graver objections, I believe, to any other course. All the knowledge, all the capacity for honest and self-forgetful thinking that the nation possesses, will not be too much to deal with the issues of the next four years.

If economics is not yet a science, at least a good deal of scientific thinking has been applied to it, and a good many men of the true scientific temperament are practising it. But they will better serve society if they realize that the old definition of economics as "the science of wealth" is a misleading abstraction. It is a social study; that is to say, the science—if it may be called one—of human beings as they are affected by wealth, the lack of wealth, or the hope of wealth in future. Grave errors in this and other branches of social study could be avoided if experts would only remember that the world is inhabited by the human race, and that even experts themselves partake of human passions and human failings.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial

The Universities and the Social Order

ONE hundred years ago the newly elected Council of New York University turned to the practical task of opening the institution. To assist its members in the formulation of plans for instruction and the determination of just how the idea of a University, created "to elevate the standard of learning" and "to diffuse knowledge and to render it more accessible to the community at large," could be carried out, a conference of the most eminent teachers and scientists of the United States was called. In November last New York University, standing strategic at the crossroads of a changing social order, called a centennial conference and invited on this occasion, not only the scholars of the United States, but those of many nations.

In such a conference it is always difficult to catch "the musical values of the symphony itself." The papers, taken singly and by themselves, left the hearer bewildered, but if one stood at a distance, one caught the underlying theme in no uncertain tones—the spiritual worth and unity of human society, the need for a better balancing of the moral and spiritual against the modern emphasis upon mechanical and physical. We, in America, the Conference told us, must find a way to see life whole.

Alfred Noyes summed up this bewilderment, "this groping blindfold in almost every department of life," when he said that the specialist "has given us so many trees to look at, that we are not only blind to the woods, but have almost ceased to believe in their existence." He, a poet, gave warning that the world had lost its power of synthesis. We have forgotten, Mr. Noyes said, that "all roads go in two directions" and that only in "the ascending road from the less to the greater" can true explanations be found.

Thomas W. Lamont painted a picture of "this bewilderment" in the mind of the typical college freshman of today; the shocking and discordant series of world events spread before the youth who, born at the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, entered our colleges only last September; but concluded on a constructive note when he said: "We are on the threshold of a new stage of progress and America must lead the way. It can go far on that way only by realizing that it is a part of the world."

Walter Lippmann reenforced the theme that ran through the symphony when he stated that the problem of today is to resolve the paradox of poverty and insecurity amidst plenty, to resolve it in a world of separate but interdependent nations, and by the democratic process.

The world needs, and desperately needs, integrated research and integrated thinking. Here is the challenge of the world of affairs to our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colleges and universities. We, our universities, are wonderfully well organized for fragmentary views of life; we are woefully weak in the presentation and organization of the integration of knowledge and the development of a conception of unity.

Even the setting of the conference accentuated the value of this theme. Meeting in a building of beauty and luxury, the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, a monument to the mechanical, the members overlooked a city facing untold social and governmental difficulties while within a stone's throw could be witnessed the failure of human engineering in a mass of human woe, a breadline —and from the window could be glimpsed a harbor traffic reaching to every corner of a disrupted and disorganized world.

This world, morally confused, economically depressed, governmentally disorganized, needs leadership and the intimate coordination of life and action. Scholars, colleges, universities, and research agencies all over the world must join in supplying this leadership, in laying out the groundwork for a better and finer synthesis.

RUFUS D. SMITH
Dean, Washington Square College, New York University.

. . .

Radicals!

A FEW readers with a shaking of the head and many readers, openly rejoicing, profess to have discovered in THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR a tendency toward liberalism. If this is true (and let us hope it is), it must be a natural result of efforts to select the most enlightening and thought provoking general articles produced today by American scholars. Some articles used are clearly conservative. True liberalism will give conservatism a fair hearing, just as sound conservatism faces fearlessly all liberalism. One must expect, however, that an author who says something more or less new and stimulating is likely to appear to many as somewhat radical—and often, of course, and fortunately for us all, he is what he appears to be. But not all non-complacency is radicalism, and not all contentedness is conservatism, or all longing for the long ago, reactionism.

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR cannot afford to be afraid of conservatism or liberalism. The editors can ask only whether the article is scholarly —that is, an honest critical attempt to get at truth through a disinterested marshalling of valid evidence—and whether it is vital and interesting to their readers. Perhaps the liberal article is most likely to stimulate reactions and lead to profitable discussions of a question from various points of view. When so goaded, even conservatives may say something fresh and challenging about the *status quo* or *status ante*.

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR and Phi Beta Kappa, it need not be said, should not be regarded as advocating any position advanced in the articles published. They assume responsibility only for judging them the best available with a view to the general interest of cutivated men and women.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Should Scientific Discoveries Be Patented?

ELMER L. SEVRINGHAUS

Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Wisconsin

THE debate about patenting scientific discoveries is not concerned wholly with the matter of profits. It is usually a matter of pride with medical men as well as with many other scientific investigators that any discoveries are given freely to the profession and the public. The tradition opposed to patent restrictions is generally assumed to be based on a renunciation of personal profit because of fraternal ideals. This spirit among productive scientists certainly must be cherished. But there are other ends to be thought of. Does free publication of a new idea, an improved formula for a remedy, or a better instrument, secure the most prompt and effective use of the discovery? Pseudo-scientific exploitation may be dishonest or may bring discredit to the science by exaggeration. How may such exploitation be prevented?

There are many necessary steps between the fundamental discovery in the laboratory and general use of the result by a non-technical public. Unless some practical control for a period of perhaps a few years can be assured, it is difficult to secure adequate backing for the adaptation to quantity production and the prompt distribution of the new article. The patent laws provide just this necessary guarantee; the result is not only profit to the inventor and the manufacturer but also a social gain. The rapid general availability of insulin for treatment of diabetes could not have been provided without this type of protection during development.

Even the strictest patent laws may be inadequate properly to protect the interests of the public, quite without regard to the discoverer and manufacturer. There are peculiar possibilities for exploitation of the public whenever a discovery relates to food or drugs. The prospective purchaser cannot commonly have sufficient technical information to choose wisely. The advertising of such materials with magic words like "vitamin," "hormone," and the names of famous laboratories, brings quick profits to the dispensers, whether the claims for the product be in the long run justified or not.

Such considerations as the above have led in the last few years to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization of non-profit corporations for administration of patents granted to scientists. The income from royalties pays for the operation of such corporations and further profits are devoted to the support of scientific research in the associated university. This plan would seem to provide for self-sustaining research. If this is the desirable procedure, every university will soon need its parallel but legally independent corporation.

But patent administration includes legal facilities to safeguard rights. It involves laboratory control of materials produced under royalties. Expensive machinery is usually found necessary. Hence the small college or university may not be able to secure such an organization for the benefit of its investigators. Shall the larger institutions have a monopoly on patenting scientific discovery and exerting effective control?

The growth of any science is based on the work of countless scientists. The small college research man is as much a part of this progress as is the university man. The college needs the financial support of the returns from patent royalties as seriously as the university science department. The dream of scientific research supported by the income from the results of applied science embodies a socialized ideal. But should not all science participate in these returns? The growth of numerous corporations for the control of patents is no guarantee of such participation. There is even the possibility of jealousy and patent wars between such semi-academic corporations.

The issues at stake are not as to whether the research worker shall gain fame or wealth from his patent. Seldom does he desire these in an immoderate way. Rarely would his colleagues or the world at large begrudge him the practical returns from a patent. But the important problems are: how shall the scientific discovery be made available promptly and how shall dishonest and discrediting exploitation be made impossible? The practical as well as the ethical question is one of wide social interest. Attention of the academic world may well be focused on such a problem in which it has a double stake.

. . .

Are Scholars News?

ARNAUD C. MARTS

A RECENT study of news items in the daily newspapers revealed that 3 per cent of all the reading matter in the nation's newspapers is news about colleges. Traditionally, scholarship and publicity have not been regarded as yoke-fellows. The scholar is pictured as one who pursues an elusive truth or fact or expression into the lonely realms where the public cannot follow. Usually he has not wanted them to follow. He has shunned the public gaze and, in his modesty, or timidity, has felt that newspaper publicity in regard to his work would bring its scholarly quality into question.

In spite of this traditional lack of sympathy between the subjects to be studied in their relation to each other, the study reveals an amazing amount of space given by many of the nation's papers to news of scholarly content.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More aggregate space was given by the newspapers during the summer of 1932 to a description and discussion of a natural phenomenon than to any other item of world news, with the possible exception of the party conventions in Chicago. For weeks in advance of the eclipse of the sun in August, the newspapers devoted columns of space to it. On the day of the eclipse it was the front page story in nearly every paper, and on the following day pictures of the sun and moon at various phases of the eclipse were reproduced in nearly every paper. Even the moronic tabloids permitted these pictures to displace those of the current triangles. One of them carried the characteristic headline "Eclipse Scientific Flop."

Another news story which ranked among the first ten in the amount of space given in the summer of 1932 had a decidedly scholarly content. It was the story of a professor who risked his life to obtain knowledge. Scholars have often done this in their quiet way, in the laboratory, in the garret, in the field. This professor, equally modest, did it in a more spectacular way and the whole literate world watched, through the newspapers, as he ascended ten miles in a Jules Verne contraption to study the stratosphere. The popular result is that several millions of people now know that there *is* a stratosphere and, knowing it, have a little clearer mental image of the universe in which they live. Another scientist lowered himself to the bottom of the sea and told millions of newspaper readers what he saw there. Thus newspapers constantly enlarge the horizons of our minds.

These "scholarly content" news clippings ranged the whole cycle of knowledge, from the story of the human hand of the Peking woman of 1,000,000 B.C. to the list of the week's best sellers. Since some scholarly topics, however, obviously interested the papers more than others, all the clippings were grouped into general classifications according to subject, and were measured for relative volume.

1. The largest amount of space during the period of the study was given to astronomy. Had not the eclipse occurred within the period, however, astronomy would have taken rank with psychology and archeology.

2. The second largest was devoted to the field of physics. The electron, atom, and cosmic ray bobbed up in the news almost daily.

3. Third in the amount of news space was the general subject of health and medicine, with special attention given to the cause and cure of cancer.

4. Fourth in volume was the economic group, accounted for by a serious discussion of the business depression.

5. Biology came fifth in volume, evidencing widespread interest in eugenics, evolution, and hormones.

6-11. Other general subjects, in the order of the volume of newspaper publicity given them, were education, literature, social science, mathematics, psychology, and archeology.

Where was philosophy? One might have expected to find it in the papers for it weaves all the threads of human knowledge and experience into some pattern which will inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pret their meaning. The newspapers show a genuine interest in all these fields of knowledge; ergo, they should show at least an equal interest in a philosophy which knits them together. But they did not. And an inquiry into why they did not reveals succinctly their policy in reference to all news of scholarly content. Newspapers are interested in personalities, in events, in actions which can be seen, described, or photographed. If one could excavate the ruins of an Arabic city and find philosophy there, philosophy would be news. If one could fly over it and drop a flag on it, philosophy would be news. If one could crush an atom and find philosophy within, philosophy would be news. If a philosopher should clothe himself in a loin-cloth, sit cross-legged on the steps of the Capitol, and expound his philosophy, then philosophy would be news.

We conclude, therefore, from this study of the news of scholarly content which does appear, and that which does not appear in the papers, that most of the newspapers are genuinely interested in scholarly content news but that such news must pass the usual test for admission to their columns — that is, it must be associated with personalities, events, or adventures which give it color and differentiate it from the drab routine of life.

. . .

Internationalism in Mathematics

WILLIAM D. CAIRNS

THE quadrennial International Congress of Mathematicians was held at Zurich, Switzerland, September 4-12, 1932, the Federal School of Technology and the University of Zurich being the genial hosts. Twenty general lectures in various fields of mathematics were given by invited representatives of ten different nationalities. There was a notable difference in the quality of these lectures in point of preparation and delivery; happily the United States was represented in able addresses given by Professors Marston Morse of Harvard University and J. W. Alexander of Princeton University. Four half-days were devoted to sectional meetings at which results of recent research were given in about 240 briefer papers. The full text of the invited lectures and extended abstracts of the contributed papers will appear in the printed volume of the Congress. The Congress was characterized by reports of extensive current research and by profitable personal contacts between mathematicians of different countries, rather than by announcements of any epoch-making discoveries.

There was also held a session of the International Mathematical Union, a body, independent of the Congress, which developed soon after the Great War. Because of the unsatisfactory character of its work and because of its decidedly political nature, representing as it does the governments rather than scientific organizations, it has been subjected to severe criticism; and at the insistence of American, English, and Danish mathematicians it was agreed to disband the Union and to ask the Congress to appoint a committee to investigate the need for a continuing body of the sort. A valuable step has thus been accom-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plished in helping to keep these international activities on a foundation truly scientific, and not subject to the uncertainties and jealousies of national politics.

Approximately 650 mathematicians came to the Congress from 41 countries, of whom 68 were mathematicians from the United States and Canada. The Congress accepted the invitation to hold the next Congress at Oslo, Norway, four years hence.

. . .

Cooperation in Archeological Research

SILVA NEW LAKE

THIS article is not a formal report of the work done by the expeditions which have gone from Harvard to the Near East in the past four or five years, but a brief account of the objectives of the expeditions and of what they have accomplished.

By the winter of 1926-27 Professors Kirsopp Lake, Robert P. Blake, and I had done a good deal of work on manuscripts, the text of the New Testament, and similar subjects, and to collect the material we needed for continuing that work Professors Lake and Blake organized an expedition to the monastic libraries in Jerusalem, and on Patmos, the peninsula of Mt. Sinai, and Mt. Athos.

From September 1927, until July 1929, we made no expeditions. The objectives set for future work, however, were:

1. The exploration and study of the Serabit plateau.

2. The collection of specimen photographs of all known dated Greek minuscule manuscripts earlier than the year 1200 A.D.

3. The study of New Testament manuscripts with a view to the reconstruction of the early texts—work involving a collection of photographs and collations from those libraries which are difficult of access.

4. The collection of photographs of all miniatures in manuscripts in libraries visited. This is primarily for the use of scholars in Paris, Princeton, and Chicago who are doing work in this field.

5. In various monasteries, the taking of those photographs needed by other scholars who had communicated their requirements to us. Chief among these were the Bollandist Fathers in Brussels and the Academy of Berlin.

6. A visit to Armenia to investigate the present condition and availability of the manuscripts which had been previously known to be in the monastic libraries in that country.

7. The further exploration of the site of Samaria.

Since 1930 we have worked at Serabit, St. Catherine's, Jerusalem, Armenia, and Germany; in 1931 at St. Catherine's, Samaria, Jerusalem, Patmos, Athos, Paris, London, and Oxford; in 1932 at Milan, Samaria, Jerusalem, Patmos, and Athos — a list of geographical names representing a series of adventures such as the attack by a jealous neighboring tribe upon the Arabs whom we were employing on Sinai; or the sudden discovery, in the spring of 1932, in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

room in the Israelite palace area at Samaria, of ivory plaques of exquisite workmanship and unknown provenance.

The work on manuscripts, whether it concern miniatures, dated manuscripts, or the text of the New Testament, has progressed steadily; already three or four articles and one book have been published, and there are more books now on the press. There has been only one serious setback. In contrast to the extremely friendly attitude of the libraries in Moscow and Leningrad as well as in Western Europe, or to that of the monastic libraries in Jerusalem, at Patmos, or on Mt. Athos, the library of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai proved entirely unwilling to cooperate. The monks not only believe their manuscripts are a source of revenue which would dry up if they were photographed but also that scholars, especially from America, have vast sums at their disposal, to be used in any manner they see fit. The monks have, therefore, set so high a price on the privilege of photography in their library that it is wholly prohibitive. This was a disaster to those scholars, who, being themselves unable to go to Sinai, had depended on the photographs which we had promised to take for them if permitted to do so. Our own chief loss was in being unable to obtain the specimen photographs of the dated manuscripts in the library, without which our Corpus is incomplete.

The expedition to Serabit almost doubled the number of previously known proto-Sinaitic inscriptions. All have been edited and a map of the region, made then, was published later by the Egyptian government. We discovered the route to the turquoise mines and to the Temple of Hathor by which the Egyptian expeditions must have reached the summit of the mountain, and found along it a number of new Egyptian inscriptions, some of them of considerable length. Only a further expedition, provided with facilities for moving large masses of rock and for building scaffoldings which would safely support the roofs of the turquoise mines, could hope to solve such questions as those which concern the permanency and size of the Egyptian settlements on the mountain, or could remove and take back to Cairo the longest and most important of the proto-Sinaitic inscriptions.

At Samaria we have had three seasons of digging in the past two years and are planning one more in the spring of 1933. We have added a great deal to the knowledge of the topography of the city at the different periods of its history, as well as to what had previously been learned of the details of the civil and religious life of its inhabitants. Two interim reports have already been published in the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, another will be out in the autumn, and the plans for the final publication of the discoveries are under way.

Israelite masonry, as shown in the earliest periods of building at Samaria, was extremely skillful and very beautiful. Enormous walls were fitted so carefully that to this day a knife-blade cannot easily be inserted in the interstices. But Samaria is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known to have been under Tyrian influence at this time, as was Jerusalem in the time of Solomon, and the fact that no examples of similar Israelite masonry in this period have been found elsewhere raises the question whether it can strictly be considered as Israelite. In any case it probably gives a better indication of what Solomon's Jerusalem was than we are ever likely to get elsewhere. This suggestion is strengthened by the discovery, in a room in the Israelite level, of a number of beautiful ivory plaques which bear a close resemblance in workmanship and motif to those previously discovered in the excavations at Arslan-Tash in Syria and proved by an inscription to belong to the reign of Hazael. Biblical students will think at once of Ahab's "house of ivory" and of Solomon's "ivory throne."

At a considerably later period there must have been in Samaria a very important cult of the goddess Kore, of which nothing had previously been known. In our two years of work a number of inscriptions have been found which refer to her, and at the end of this season we at last uncovered two marble statues of the goddess.

In the Christian period Samaria still existed, and, on a spot which is to this day the cemetery of the five Arab Christian families which still linger in the village, we uncovered a medieval church with remnants of frescoes still on the walls. In the diary of a pilgrim of the Middle Ages, named Phocas, there is an account of a visit to Samaria and the description of a church built on the traditional site of the burial of the head of John the Baptist. This description corresponds point for point with the church which we found, and in one of the frescoes we can still make out the remnants of the picture of the burial of John's head.

We believed when we started to collect money for the work, that three years of excavation would solve the outstanding problems in regard to Samaria; but we now realize that we have raised even more problems than money, and that even a further three years of work would still leave enough to be learned to tempt archeologists to return there, for Samaria is an immense site. No city was more important for the history of Israel, with the possible exception of Jerusalem, which cannot be excavated, than Samaria; and it shares with Cæsarea the honor of being the chief Greek city of Palestine in the Roman period, when it was named Sebaste in honor of the Emperor Augustus.

In carrying on our work we have had the cooperation of Harvard University, the Catholic University of Washington, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, the Palestine Exploration Fund, the British School of Archeology in Jerusalem, the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem, the University of Leiden, and the American Council of Learned Societies.

One of the interesting problems which our organization raises is that of whether the same vivid continuity could better be maintained by a university or some other formal body; or whether our looseness of structure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and informality of control is not an advantage. Probably the small and informal group of vitally interested people is to the advantage of the work itself, while the larger administrative body can more easily raise the necessary funds and overcome external difficulties.

. . .

The Institute of Law, Johns Hopkins University

LEON C. MARSHALL

SINCE 1906 research in law has been part of the conscious planning of the Johns Hopkins University. It was not until 1928, however, that the planning came to fruition, through the formal establishment of "an institute devoted primarily to the scientific study of law." The Institute adopted as its program for the first few years the study of the administration of law and the impacts of law upon human life. Within this area it placed particular emphasis upon the development of large masses of dependable data. In consequence it engaged, in cooperation with the Judicial Councils of Ohio and Maryland, in the analysis of the administration of justice in those states. A "survey of litigation" was also begun in New York City.

The objectives of the state-wide studies reveal the Institute's outlook upon its task. Within the limits of resources available the Institute is studying the trends of litigation and its human causes and effects; the machinery and functioning of the various agencies of the administration of justice; the reasons for delays, expense, and uncertainty; and the points at which changes in substantive law would contribute markedly to social welfare. It looks forward, also, to establishing a permanent system of judicial records and statistics.

The word "permanent" is much in the forefront of the Institute's thinking. The Institute, in addition to the effort to secure permanent statistical systems, has made cooperative arrangements with other educational institutions, with judicial councils, and with bar associations; looking toward the development of local agencies to continue the work in an indefinite future, and to make the needed practical applications. It is this situation which led Justice Cardozo to say: "The Institute of Law of the Johns Hopkins University marks a new method of approach to the problems of our legal system and a method of approach most significant and helpful. . . . The time is at hand, I am persuaded, when through the cooperation of the Institute with judicial councils of the states and nation, there will come into being an agency for the scientific development of law whose activities and achievements will be not merely haphazard and occasional, but methodical and constant. . . . I hail the dawn of the new hope."

. . .

Foreign Fellowships

THE Institute of International Education recently issued the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fourth edition of a publication listing fellowships and scholarships which under various auspices are available for foreign study. The grants are arranged in two groups; the first including those open to competition from students of any college or university, and the second part listing the grants made by educational institutions to those students who are affiliated with the specific institution offering the award.

The majority of the fellowships listed in Part I specify the subject of the research to be pursued and require graduate candidates. The only large groups which are unrestricted either as to subject or as to place of study are the fellowships of the Guggenheim Foundation and some of those offered by the American Association of University Women. Almost every subject that might be suitable for research, however, is represented. In some cases the place of study is designated. There is also a group of fellowships unrestricted as to subject of study but not as to place. The largest number of grants designated for study in Great Britain are the Rhodes Scholarships and these are also among the few which may be awarded to undergraduates. By far the largest number stipulated for the different countries of Europe are the so called "Exchange" fellowships offered under the auspices of the Institute of International Education. With the exception of the Exchange fellowships, which cover only board, lodging, and tuition or their equivalent, the awards made by foundations and organizations of various types offer money grants ranging from $1000 to $2500, the majority being under $2000.

Part II lists between 250 and 300 fellowships, granted by educational institutions, including a few art and theological schools, which may be used for study abroad. About half of these awards carry a stipend of less than $1000 and the rest between $1000 and $2000, although there are a few as low as $250 and a limited number over $2000.

The Institute administers, also, the fellowships offered by the American Field Service and the Germanistic Society of America.

The *Bulletin* gives the necessary information, including academic requirements and time and place for making application.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion

A Student Requests a Course on War

RUFUS E. MILES, JR.*
Antioch College, 1932

We, who oppose the use of war as a means of settling international disputes, urge the substitution of reason for might in determining the course of our civilization. So, too, do our colleges and universities. If any one ideal could be said to dominate the academic institutions of this country, it is probably the use of reason and its application to all problems, philosophical, social, and personal. There should, then, be a fundamental harmony existing between those who oppose war, and American colleges and universities. Yet this problem of war and peace, one of the greatest facing our civilization, has not been dealt with in any systematic way in these institutions. As such, it has no place in their curricula. It is touched upon in history courses, treated desultorily in international relations, given a third slant by military training courses, but nowhere are the facts brought coherently into a stimulating presentation of the problem. Yet the colleges could make such a presentation without in any way prejudicing their traditions or present policies.

I propose to outline very briefly a few suggestions for a course, called "War and Peace." The aim of the course is to make a thoroughly scientific analysis of the institution of war. It would inquire into the purposes for which war has been fought, investigate the validity of those purposes, and attempt to find out in how far they have or have not been accomplished. It would examine cases where both the peaceful and the warlike methods have been used to settle similar disputes, and insofar as the data justify, it would compare the results of the two methods. It would deal with the origin of war, the causes of war, the cost of war in social values, the methods and possibly the future of war. It would look at the problem from all important angles with a view to understanding it and solving it; it would, in short, be a thoroughly unimpassioned and penetrating study of war.

The course would consist, I suggest, of two single semester parts, divided simply into a study of war during the first semester and an analysis of means of cooperating for peace

*Second prize paper in competition offered to the students and undergraduates of the colleges and universities of the United States by The New History Society. Reprinted from *The New Historian*, July, 1932, organ of The New History Foundation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the second semester. Either could be taken without the other. That is to say: if a student should become convinced of the desirability of war as an instrument of social change, as a result of the first semester course, it would be his privilege to withdraw and devote himself to military training courses. This course on war and peace would probably be optional to all students of sophomore ranking or above, without prerequisite. It would be well in teaching the course to be able to assume more maturity and stability than is possessed by a great many freshmen.

The course might be organized in somewhat the following manner:

I. The Institution of War.
  A. Probable Origin and Pre-history.
  B. History: A before and after analysis of outstanding wars known to history, their avowed purposes and their results.
    1. From a political point of view.
    2. From an economic point of view.
    3. From a biological point of view.
  C. Why We Go to War: An analysis of some of the international complications and difficulties which lead to war.
  D. Modern Warfare: An analytic description of modern war methods.
  E. Reason *versus* Might: A sociological and philosophical discussion.
  F. The Foundations of Nationalism.

II. Methods of Cooperating for Peace.
  A. Through the Use of Force.
    1. Military Preparedness.
    2. The International Police Force.
    3. The Economic Boycott.
  B. Through Official Inter-governmental Cooperation.
    1. League of Nations and World Court.
    2. Multi-power Pacts and Mutual Non-aggression Pacts.
    3. Disarmament Conferences.
    4. Other Methods.
  C. Through Unofficially Organized Public Opinion.
    1. The Pacifist Movement and the Gandhi Movement.
    2. The Institute of Pacific Relations, etc.

The problem could probably be most effectively presented in a symposium manner. An historian to present the history of war, a political scientist to present the problems of international relations, a militarist to present the methods of modern warfare, and a sociologist or a philosopher to discuss reason *versus* might and the validity of nationalism, could cooperate to present a vivid picture of the existing problem of war. The second semester, devoted to means of cooperating for peace, might again include a militarist, or at least an able advocate of preparedness as a means of securing peace, once more the professor of international relations to present a survey of organizations to

Continued on page 120

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA

FOURTEENTH EDITION
IN TWENTY-FOUR VOLUMES

AN INCOMPARABLE SOURCE BOOK OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE

Neither effort nor money was spared to bring into this standard encyclopædia of the world the latest authoritative information in text and picture on every conceivable subject of human interest. And all this material was designed to meet the needs of men, women, and children in the home, in business, and in the school.

The Encyclopædia Britannica carries in its twenty-four volumes no less than 35,000,000 words written by more than 3,500 world authorities. This text is richly illustrated with 15,000 pictures, many in color, and with 500 maps, 200 of which are in color. Considering the completeness and authority of its text and the quality of its illustrations the new Britannica is the least expensive encyclopædia you can buy.

As little as $5 down and $5 a month for a few months will bring the set to your home for your immediate use and enjoyment.

You will receive, free, literature describing the Britannica, its four beautiful bindings, and its prices and plans of easy payment if you mail the coupon below. No obligation.

OWNERS SAY

JAMES R. ANGELL

"The more carefully I have examined the text, the more profound has become my admiration for this great monument to human intelligence. . . . The range of subjects which the volumes cover perhaps justifies the title 'Encyclopædia' more completely than any work which has preceded. . . . The result is a work of consuming interest and one which establishes a standard that will long remain unchallenged."

JAMES GRIER HIBBEN

"As a source of accurate and interesting information it will be of incalculable value in any household."

2 Am Sc-2

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, INC.
342 Madison Ave., New York City

Please send me, by return mail, without obligation, your new illustrated booklet with color plates and maps from the latest Britannica, together with low price offer representing a saving of many dollars.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promote international cooperation, and again the sociologist to discuss the great non-cooperative protest movements, such as pacifism and the Gandhi movement. Whereas a course somewhat along these lines would possess the added advantage, if conducted by a number of professors, of escaping the possibility of attack on the grounds of its propagandizing, the material can be so organized, as I have attempted to show, that even were it taught by a single broad-minded professor, it would not be liable to this criticism.

Considerable emphasis has been laid, it will be noticed, upon the pure study of war. There are, I think, two excellent reasons for this emphasis. In the first place, it is admittedly sensible to be completely acquainted with a problem before attempting to find a solution to it. Many people who wholeheartedly work for world peace make the mistake, however, of failing to understand the problem of war before they advocate a solution. Secondly, a thorough understanding of the problem furnishes an emotional drive toward its solution which can never be obtained in any way other than that of first-hand experience. It has been wisely remarked that unless some concrete method of securing peace is devised before the generation which fought the World War passes on, another and greater world calamity is not unlikely. That statement is based on the well-known principle of human action and inaction, that people are moved to solve only those problems which come close to them in experience. As the World War recedes into history the will to strive toward the solution of the war problem dwindles. Here is where education may show its true mettle. The purpose of education is not only to develop the use of reason, but to give the student a maximum possible amount of experience, vicariously. Unless this is done vigorously and vividly its value is small, but if and when it is done, it may furnish the greatest emotional drive toward the solution of the problems of humanity. It is for these two reasons that so much emphasis is laid on the pure study of war.

The request that is herein made to American colleges and universities is a reasonable one. The board of trustees of every college in the United States should sanction a course of the general type outlined above. If the war problem is impressed in a forceful manner on those who will be the leaders of tomorrow, there may be a real chance of its solution. To what higher ideal could a college be committed?

. . .

Comment Invited

THE remission in part of the War and post-War debts due our government from foreign nations might take the form of an endowment in the currencies of the respective countries for university scholarships for their nationals here. This would require the incumbents of the scholarships to buy dollars for their stay here but not the governments, which could pay the income or stipend to the holders in their own currencies. The governments would thus effect a material reduction in their debts to us by

Continued on page 122

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERPRETATIONS 1931-32

Edited by Allan Nevins

by WALTER LIPPMANN

One hundred of Lippmann's famous commentaries upon events here and abroad in the most vital year of modern times. "We have here an interpretation of American politics which today no intelligent inquirer can ignore and which in future decades will interest, inform and delight the man who would know about these times."—William Allen White. $2.50

Carson, the Advocate

by EDWARD MARJORIBANKS

The authorized biography of Sir Edward Carson, probably the greatest of contemporary English lawyers, with details of his part in the formation of the Irish Republic and in the notable cases of the last fifty years. $3.00

Criminals and Politicians

by DENIS TILDEN LYNCH

The noted author of the life of Boss Tweed writes a thrilling and appalling exposé of the entente between corrupt public official and gangdom. He points the cure in a study of the so-called "N. J." (racketless) towns. $2.00

Blesséd Spinoza

by LEWIS BROWNE

The first complete biography in English of one of the greatest thinkers of all human history. "A tale of conflict; a story of paradox. Grips you with its note of drama"—*New York Evening Sun.* $4.00

A New Deal by STUART CHASE

The book on economics that is a national best seller. In his distinctive graphic style, Chase forecasts the next phase and tells how and why it must come. "As a guide to modern economic thinking, this book stands alone." —*Chicago Evening Post.* "The best book I have yet met on this economic crisis."—*N. Y. Herald Tribune.* $2.00

FOR POETRY LOVERS

Nicodemus by EDWIN A. ROBINSON

The book of new short poems long awaited by the thousands of admirers of his "Tristram". It has all the deep power and beauty of his earlier works. $1.75

A Tale of Troy by JOHN MASEFIELD

England's Poet Laureate tells in stirring verse the story of the Trojan War—of Helen, the pursuit, the siege, the ruse of the Horse. Each poem a unit in a dramatic ensemble. $1.50

At All Bookstores

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a provision for this partial revision downward in the present schedules of debt settlement, with the amounts so written off made available for endowment in their own currencies which, with the present rate of exchange, they could far more easily establish than they could buy dollars for payment of interest or for payment on account of principal here.

CHESTER D. PUGSLEY.

. . .

"The American Scholar" Strikes Fire

I hope that the esthetic quality and non-partisan social concern of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR find their way into the homes and offices of our country.

Newton D. Baker.

Congratulations on the latest issue of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR. You are making an extraordinarily good and useful quarterly.

Walter Lippmann.

I really have nothing but praise for THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR. There have been a number of articles which have occasioned a great deal of discussion amongst a few of us. I do believe that there was a great need for a magazine of its character, especially in times such as these when it becomes obvious that well trained leadership must lead us out of chaos.

A Fraternity Editor.

From the Professions

I consider THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, especially the last issue, as the one magazine of that nature I would not be without.

A Lawyer.

The articles gain by their brevity —they have to make their point quickly and pungently. . . . No thinking man, confused frequently by the fogs and unbased assertions characteristic of today's press and political spell-bindery, can get along without your valuable quarterly. Just go on on the track you are following, giving men of scholarly interests the frank comments on present day living of others who "know"!

A Minister.

I cannot resist the impulse to express my admiration. I had not hoped to live to see the day when the official organ of our ancient society would contain such utterances. . . . Once more ΦBK seems to be taking—*mutatis mutandis*, as it should—that attitude toward our life which it took in the great address from which the organ takes its name.

A College Professor of English.

We are well pleased in our family with THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR. Its printing and type are very satisfactory, and its range of subjects is wide. It is scholarly without being pedantic, and informative without being statistical. We are glad to have it on our home reading table.

A Professor of Electrical Engineering.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Your caption "Renewals Sustain Life" connotes the essence of your magazine for me. Its contents furnish relaxation and nourishment for the mind, and keep one in touch with the great movements in the world today.

A Doctor.

The last copy was so splendidy momentous that I have loaned my copy to several friends. My opinion is not as learned as most but I feel that if the quality of articles in your magazine continues, it will be the most satisfactory of any publication to which I subscribe. All articles are splendid but the two which filled a mental gap for me were "The Passing of American Individualism" and "Reparations and War Debts."

A Housewife.

Special Offer for 1933

The American Scholar

at the special price of $1.50 for the year instead of $2.00 *if orders are received in lots of 20 or more subscriptions.*

Copies will be mailed individually if requested.

This Offer Is Made Specially

to

Fraternity Groups
Undergraduates in Colleges
High School or Faculty Groups
Clubs

Will every reader who believes that THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR has something to contribute to our Western present-day civilization not only get us another $2.00 reader, but, if he can, either personally or through a representative, get a 20 subscription order?

THE RADCLIFFE CHAPTER OF ΦBK last year sent in a 34 subscription order from its membership, and THE DELTA GAMMA FRATERNITY, the first one to take advantage of this special offer, has subscribed for 49 of its Houses.

Orders received before the end of March will begin with the January number.

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR
145 West 55th Street New York

Announcing

IMMIGRANT GIFTS TO AMERICAN LIFE

By Allen H. Eaton

◆ ◆ ◆

A presentation of the important contributions immigrants can make to America through their wealth of Old World arts, crafts, and cultures. How homelands exhibitions have brought these gifts to more general notice, with suggestions for future exhibitions.

◆ ◆ ◆

"It is a fascinating book, and one which deserves earnest consideration from the American-born citizen who otherwise can only partially realize just what the problem of the immigrant is and what his value is to the nation."—*Boston Transcript.*

◆ ◆ ◆

Illustrated with 48 aquatone prints and five color plates. "A volume altogether delightful in text, pictures and background."—*Survey.*

Price, $3.00

Address

Russell Sage Foundation
130 East 22d St. New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Phi Beta Kappa Authors

The asterisk indicates presentation to the library of the United Chapters.

Poetry, Drama, Fiction

ANDERSON, WILLIAM A., William and Mary 1904, *Yellow Flood*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Co. $2.

BROWN, CARLETON, Carleton 1915, Editor, *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

BUCK, PEARL S., Randolph-Macon 1932, *Sons*. New York: The John Day Co. $2.50

——— *The Young Revolutionist*. New York: Friendship Press. $1.50.

CORBETT, ELIZABETH, Wisconsin 1910, *After 5 o'Clock*. New York: The Century Co. $2.

*CHASE, STANLEY P., Bowdoin 1905, Editor (with others), *The Pearl*. Boston: Bruce Humphries, Inc. $1.50.

CRANE, RONALD S., Michigan 1908, Editor, *A Collection of English Poems, 1660–1800*. New York: Harper & Bros. $4.

GLASGOW, ELLEN, William and Mary 1920, *The Sheltered Life*. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. $2.50.

KRAPP, GEORGE PHILIP, Johns Hopkins 1899, Editor, *The Vercelli Book*. New York: Columbia University Press. $3.50.

LIEBERMAN, ELIAS, College of the City of New York 1903, Editor, *Poems for Enjoyment*. New York: Harper & Bros.

MACLEISH, ARCHIBALD, Yale 1915, *Before March*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

*MAIER, MARQUE, Princeton 1922, *Lina Sarger*. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House. $2.

*MORTON, DAVID, Vanderbilt 1920, *A Man of Earth*. Amherst: The Poetry Society of Amherst College.

———*Earth's Processional*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.

NITZE, WILLIAM A., Johns Hopkins 1895, and T. ATKINSON JENKINS, Swarthmore 1896, Editor, *Perieswaus: Le Haut Livre Du Graal*. Volume I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. $6.

PALMER, FREDERICK, Allegheny 1920, *So a Leader Came*. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, Inc. $2.

POST, CHANDLER RATHFON, Harvard 1904, *A History of Spanish Painting*. Volume IV. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

ROBERTS, ELIZABETH MADOX, Michigan 1921, *The Haunted Mirror*. New York: The Viking Press. $2.50.

SARETT, LEW, Beloit 1931, *Wings Against the Moon*. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $2.

SIMONSON, LEE, Harvard 1909, *The Stage Is Set*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. $5.

STRATTON, CLARENCE, Pennsylvania 1900, *In Singapore*. Boston: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard. $1.50.

TUELL, ANNE KIMBALL, Wellesley College 1925, *A Victorian at Bay*. Boston: Marshall Jones Co.

VAN DYKE, HENRY, Princeton 1910, *A Creelful of Fishing Stories*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 2.50.

Works on Literature and Art

BEACH, JOSEPH WARREN, Minnesota 1900, *The Twentieth Century Novel: Studies in Technique*. New York: The Century Co.

BROOKS, VAN WYCK, Harvard 1908, *Sketches in Criticism*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $3.50.

GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., Chicago 1899, *Buying Happiness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

GREEN, ADWIN WIGFALL, Virginia 1930, *The Inns of Court and Early English Drama*. New Haven: Yale University Press. $3.

HAIGHT, ELIZABETH HAZELTON, Vassar 1899, *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., $2.50.

HEMPL, GEORGE, Michigan 1908, *Mediterranean Studies: IV. Etruscan: V. Venetic and Venetic Inscriptions*. Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press. $1.

PALMER, GEORGE HERBERT, Harvard 1874, *The Lord's Prayer*. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. 50c.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

History, Government, Biography

*Anderson, Mrs. Louis F., Vassar 1903, *Through the Hawse-Hole*. New York: The Macmillan Co. Illustrated $3.

Burkhard, Arthur, Minnesota 1911, *Conrad Ferdinand Meyer*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $2.50.

Dabney, Virginius, Virginia 1920, *Liberalism in the South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. $3.50.

Flick, Alexander C., Syracuse 1901, Editor (with others), *The History of the State of New York*. Volumes I and II. New York: Columbia University Press.

Handler, Milton, Columbia 1924, Editor, *The Federal Anti-Trust Laws*. New York: Commerce Clearing House, Inc.

Harvey, Edwin D., Yale 1907, *The Mind of China*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hazen, Charles Downer, Dartmouth 1889, *The French Revolution*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Howe, Mark A. DeWolfe, Lehigh 1887, *New Letters of James Russell Lowell* (Φ B K Harvard 1846). New York: Harper & Bros.

Lockwood, Frank C., Northwestern 1902, *Pioneer Days in Arizona*. New York: The Macmillan Co. $4.

Lowell, A. Lawrence, Harvard 1877, *Conflicts of Principles*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lowenthal, Marvin, Wisconsin 1915, *A World Passed By*. New York: Harper & Bros.

McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, Jr., Harvard 1913, *Jonathan Edwards* (Φ B K Yale 1840). New York: Harper & Bros. $2.50.

Nevins, Allan, Illinois 1912, *Grover Cleveland* (Φ B K Princeton 1907). New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., $5.

Page, Elwin L., Williams 1900, *George Washington in New Hampshire*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $2.

Pearson, Henry Greenleaf, Harvard 1893, *Son of New England: James Jackson Storrow, 1864–1926* (Φ B K Harvard 1910). Boston: Privately printed.

*Pipkin, Charles W., Vanderbilt 1932, *Social Politics and Modern Democracies*. Volumes I and II. New York: The Macmillan Co. $7.50.

*Preston, Howard Willis, Brown 1883, *Autograph Letters and Documents of George Washington*. Providence: State Bureau of Information.

Harpers
MAGAZINE

FIVE MONTHS
for only
ONE DOLLAR
Just half the news-stand price!

A subscriber has just written us,

"If there is constructive sanity anywhere in these troubled years, it is found within the bright covers of Harpers Magazine."

Just now, when thoughtful Americans need all the mental alertness and spiritual fortitude they can muster, Harpers is proving a stout ally in this business of straight and courageous thinking.

To introduce the magazine to those logical readers whose names are not yet on our list, we are making a special offer of five months for only $1.00. Return the coupon below to be sure of enjoying

50 articles and 20 stories including:

THE R. F. C. AND THE BANKERS
by John T. Flynn

THE PROBLEM OF FAITH
by Aldous Huxley

THE CURSE OF MIDAS
by Bertrand Russell

AMERICA AND THE ORIENT
by Nathaniel Peffer

WHY THE POLICE FAIL
by Herbert Best

Special Introductory Offer

HARPERS MAGAZINE P-1
49 East 33rd St., N. Y. C.

I am enclosing one dollar for your five months' offer to new subscribers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

.....

When writing to advertisers please mention The American Scholar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RITTER, HALSTED L., DePauw 1891, *Washington as a Business Man.* New York: Sears & Co.

*ROBINSON, NELSON L., St. Lawrence 1899, *St. Lawrence University in the World War, 1917–1918.* Canton: Published by the University.

SHANKS, LEWIS PIAGET, Johns Hopkins 1928, *Anatole France: The Mind and the Man.* New York: Harper & Bros. $2.50.

SWANN, NANCY LEE, Texas 1906, *Pan Chao:* Foremost Woman Scholar of China: First Century A. D. Background, Ancestry, Life and Writings of the Most Celebrated Chinese Woman of Letters. New York: The Century Co. $6.

THOMAS, NORMAN, Princeton 1905, and PAUL BLANSHARD, Michigan 1914, *What's the Matter with New York?* New York: The Macmillan Co.

TREAT, PAYSON J., Wesleyan 1906, *Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Japan, 1853–1895.* Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

WEYGANDT, CORNELIUS, Pennsylvania 1907, *A Passing America.* New York: Henry Holt & Co. $3.

Philosophy and Psychology

DUNLAP, KNIGHT, Johns Hopkins 1907, *Habits: Their Making and Unmaking.* New York: Boni Liveright, Inc.

FORD, ADELBERT, Michigan 1920, *The Story of Scientific Psychology.* New York: Sears & Co.

HARTSHORNE, HUGH, Amherst 1907, *Character in Human Relations.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

Religion

ADDISON, JAMES THAYER, Harvard 1909, *Life Beyond Death.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $3.

ALBRIGHT, WILLIAM FOXWELL, Johns Hopkins 1916, *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible.* New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.

BROWN, CHARLES R., Yale 1915, *Have We Outgrown Religion?* New York: Harper & Bros. $2.

CROSS, EARLE BENNETT, Brown 1905, *Modern Worship and the Psalter.* New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.

DAY, CLARENCE, Hamilton 1911, *God and My Father.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $1.

FRIESS, HORACE L., Columbia 1918, and HERBERT W. SCHNEIDER, Columbia 1915, *Religion in Various Cultures.* New York: Henry Holt & Co.

GILKEY, JAMES G., Harvard 1912, *Managing One's Self.* New York: The Macmillan Co. $1.75.

HUME, ROBERT E., Yale 1898, *Treasure-House of the Living Religions.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

MCGIFFERT, ARTHUR CUSHMAN, Western Reserve 1885, *A History of Christian Thought* (Volume I: Early and Eastern). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.

PHILLIPS, HAROLD COOKE, Denison 1919, *Seeing the Invisible.* New York: Harper & Bros. $1.

SWIFT, ARTHUR L., Williams 1913, Editor, *Religion Today—A Challenging Enigma.* New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Co.

TITTLE, ERNEST FREMONT, Ohio Wesleyan 1909, *Jesus After Nineteen Centuries.* New York: The Abingdon Press. $2.

Science

HARING, HARRY A., Western Reserve 1898, *The Slabsides Book of John Burroughs.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $2.50.

*MCCRADY, EDWARD, Sewanee 1931, *Idealism and the New Physics.* Pamphlet. Privately printed.

MAJOR, RALPH H., Johns Hopkins 1910, *Classic Descriptions of Disease.* Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas. $5.50.

MILLIKAN, ROBERT A., Oberlin 1910, *This Changing World.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

TERMAN, FREDERICK EMMONS, Stanford 1920, *Radio Engineering.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. $5.

WICKENDEN, WILLIAM E., Denison 1911, and ROBERT H. SPAHR, Washington and Lee 1930, *A Study of Technical Institutes.* Lancaster: The Lancaster Press, Inc. $1.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A certain few men

reaped knowledge; their own, their contemporaries', their predecessors' — stored it away for future generations, making us their heirs.

PHILLIPS RUSSELL

(*Author of "Benjamin Franklin" and "Emerson"*) searchingly analyzes, brilliantly records the lives, works, times of seven men who, because they reaped and stored, became

Harvesters

"Harvesters" is the biography of Frederick Caesar who dipped bloody hands into Asia and extracted algebra; Leonardo da Vinci who executed mediaevalism with a dozen weapons; Copernicus who doubted; Martin Luther who tempered belief with reason; Cortes who sought and found; Watt who wondered; Jefferson who rewrote the social plan. Under Phillips Russell's pen, seven pages of history leap to life. He imbues the reader with his own conviction that the past still lives vibrantly.

BRENTANO'S $3.50

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER

Newly translated into English Prose by

T. E. SHAW

As Lawrence of Arabia he gave us *Revolt in the Desert* and *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. Now as Aircraftsman T. E. Shaw he offers "the oldest book worth reading for its story and the first novel of modern Europe," in a magnificent new translation, "not for scholars but for *everybody*." Presented in a format designed by Bruce Rogers, this distinguished volume is the most beautiful book of the season. "... one of the notable books of our time." —*Henry Seidel Canby*.

Of all Booksellers $3.50

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

114 Fifth Avenue, New York

For Sale

The Westover

Among the Litchfield Hills, on Bantam Lake, Connecticut

Eight acres of lawn, meadow and woodland. 900 feet of shore front on the west side of Bantam Lake, the largest natural lake in Connecticut. Altitude 900 feet.

It is possible to secure an adjoining 25 acres.

Equipped for and being used as a girls' camp. Could be developed as a private school property, as a summer home, or for summer assemblies. Owner might consider renting.

Four cottages with twenty-six rooms. Driven well. Hot and cold water in most houses.
One five room bungalow, suitable for infirmary.
Separate dining hall and kitchen, equipped, four rooms for help.
One recreation hall, 3 rooms, 3 fireplaces.
Eight garages. Storehouse. Woodhouse. Dock.
Bathing beach. Tennis courts.
Buildings and grounds electric lighted.

For further particulars apply to

DAVID LAYTON

145 West 55th Street, New York

Brilliant Biography of an Unusual Family

By C. Hartley Grattan

THE THREE JAMESES:

A Family of Minds

A completely engrossing biography of that unique family group, the James family: Henry James, Sr., religious prophet and 'citizen of the world'; William James, psychologist-philosopher; and Henry James, novelist.

"Both beautiful and brilliant."—*Claude Bowers*. "A critical analysis, always intelligent and often penetrating."—*New York Times*. "A sound interpretation of three extraordinarily fascinating characters."—*North American Review*.

***Illustrated*, $3.50**

LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY

55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

When writing to advertisers please mention THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Business, Economics, Sociology

BOUCKE, OSWALD FRED, Michigan 1909, *Laissez Faire and After*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co. $2.

BRANDEIS, LOUIS D., Harvard 1895, *Other People's Money*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes & Co. $2.

DANIELS, WINTHROP M., Princeton 1899, *American Railroads*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. $1.50.

DONHAM, WALLACE BRETT, Harvard 1922, *Business Looks at the Unforeseen*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

EDIE, LIONEL D., Colgate 1915, *Economics and Problems*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co. $5.

*HAYMAKER, EDWARD M., Lafayette 1890, *A Sociological Analysis of Roman Catholicism*. Privately printed, $2.25.

KELLER, ALBERT G., Yale 1896, *Man's Rough Road*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes & Co. (with the Yale University Press). $3.

MANSFIELD, HARVEY C., Cornell 1927, *The Lake Cargo Coal Rate Controversy*. New York: Columbia University Press. $4.25.

MARSHALL, LEON C., Ohio Wesleyan 1908, (with GEOFFREY MAY) *The Divorce Court*. Volume I, *Maryland*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. $3.

PATTERSON, ERNST MINOR, Pennsylvania 1930, *Power and the Public*. Volume 159. Part I. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Philadelphia, Pa. $2.50.

WITHERS, WILLIAM, Columbia 1926, *The Retirement of National Debts*. New York: Columbia University Press. $5.

Education and Textbooks

COE, GEORGE A., Rochester 1887, *Educating for Citizenship*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.

KILPATRICK, WILLIAM HEARD, William and Mary 1918, *Education and the Social Crisis*. Boni Liveright, Inc.

LEARNED, HENRY DEXTER, Pennsylvania 1912, *A Modern Introductory French Book*. New York: Oxford University Press. $1.70.

*MCGLOTHLIN, WILLIAM J., South Carolina 1926, *Baptist Beginnings in Education*. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. $1.75.

PARK, CLYDE W., Ohio State 1907, *English Applied in Technical Writing*. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co.

STRATTON, CLARENCE, Pennsylvania 1900, *Cleveland English Grammar and Composition Test* (with others). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

TEWKSBURY, DONALD G., Columbia 1920, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. $2.50.

VOS, BERT J., Johns Hopkins 1896, *Oral and Written German*. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co.

WOOD, BARRY, Harvard 1932, *What Price Football*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $1.75.

Miscellaneous

BURTON, HARRY E., Harvard 1890, *The Discovery of the Ancient Word*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $1.50.

STEVENSON, EDWARD LUTHER, Rutgers 1891, *Geography of Claudius Ptolemy*; hand colored photographic reproduction of the original vellum manuscript, ca. 1460 by Donnus Nicholaus Germanus. New York: Privately printed.

Erratum, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 509: substitute Harold Ordway Rugg, Dartmouth 1908, for Harold G. Rugg, Dartmouth Φ B K 1906, as author of *Culture and Education in America*.

Phi Beta Kappa Contributors to This Issue

Bernard Iddings Bell, Columbia 1929.
Raymond Leslie Buell, Occidental 1927.
W. D. Cairns, Ohio Wesleyan 1908.
David Cushman Coyle, Princeton 1908.
John Livingston Lowes, Washington University 1914.
Leon C. Marshall, Ohio Wesleyan 1908.
Arnaud C. Marts, Oberlin 1910.
Dewitt H. Parker, Harvard 1906.
Elmer L. Sevringhaus, Wisconsin 1916.
Rufus D. Smith, Cornell 1907.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The

L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY

Sole Official Jewelers
to
ΦBK

brings to you the *advantages* of
leadership in the *insignia* field

For you who achieved executive responsibilities we offer our service in

COMMERCIAL INSIGNIA
DIE STAMPED STATIONERY
TROPHIES
MEDALS
AWARDS
CUPS

For you who serve as Educators we offer this excellence in

HIGH SCHOOL RINGS
TYPEWRITING AND SHORTHAND AWARDS
FRATERNITY BADGES
CLASS GIFTS
DIPLOMAS
PINS

Our representatives in every State, and Branch Offices in principal cities, are prepared to give immediate, personal service

L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY
ATTLEBORO MASSACHUSETTS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED